DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 690 CG 019 229

TITLE	Reauthorization of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. United States Senate, Ninety-Ninth Congress, Second Session on Reviewing Legislation on the Reauthorization of ACTION Programs.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.
REPORT NO	Senate-Hrg-99-576
PUB DATE	6 Feb 86
NOTE	148p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Federal Programs; Hearings; *Social Services; *Voluntary Agencies; *Volunteers
IDENTIFIERS	ACTION (Agency); Congress 99th

ABSTRACT

This document presents witness testimonies and prepared statements from the Senate hearing called to consider the reauthorization of ACTION programs. Opening remarks by Senators Orrin G. Hatch and Paula Hawkins discuss ACTION, a federal agency whose purpose is to advocate, promote, and support the voluntary efforts of citizens in solving the problems of the poor, the disabled, the elderly, and children with special needs. Testimony and prepared statements of the following witnesses are presented: (1) Donna Alvarado, director, ACTION Agency; (2) Nancy Doctor, president of the National Association of Senior Companion Program Directors; (3) Jim H. Sugarman, president, National Association of Retired Senior Volunteer Program Directors; (4) Betty Manley and Reta Katzman, vice-president and president respectively, National Association of Foster Grandparent Program Directors; (5) Ira Greiff, project director, St. Francis House, Boston; (6) Daisy Martin, Sister Jean Goering, and Frances Judd, volunteers; (7) Senator Edward M. Kennedy; and (8) Margaret L. Petito. Additional materials included are an article on the plight of the homeless and responses by the administration to questions submitted by the committee. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED271690

S. HRG. 99-576

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE ACT OF 1973

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

Reviewing legislation on the reauthorization of ACTION programs

FEBRUARY 6, 1986

CG 019229

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1986

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

58-263 O - 86 - 1

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah, *Chairman*

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
DON NICKLES, Oklahoma
PAULA HAWKINS, Florida
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., Connecticut
MALCOLM WALLOP, Wyoming
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts

RONALD F. DOCKSAI, *Staff Director*
THOMAS M. ROLLINS, *Minority Staff Director/Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

PAULA HAWKINS, Florida, *Chairman*

DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa
DON NICKLES, Oklahoma
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
(ex officio)

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
(ex officio)

ROBIN RUSHTON, *Counsel*
MARSHA RENWANZ, *Minority Professional Staff*

3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1986

	Page
Alvarado, Donna, Director, ACTION Agency, accompanied by Rick Ventura, Deputy Director, Dan Bonner, Associate Director of Domestic Operations, and Lowell Genebach, Budget Officer	9
Prepared statement of Ms. Alvarado	14
Doctor, Nancy, president, National Association of Senior Companion Program Directors, Owensboro, KY; Jim H. Sugarman, president, National Association of Retired Senior Volunteer Program Directors, New York, NY, and Betty Manley, vice president, National Association of Foster Grandparent Program Directors, San Jose, CA	42
Prepared statement of Ms. Doctor (with enclosure)	48
Prepared statement of Mr. Sugarman	69
Prepared statement of Ms. Katzman	77
Greiff, Ira, project director, St. Francis House, Boston, MA; Daisy Martin, foster grandparent volunteer, Fort Lauderdale, FL, and Sister Jean Goering, Med-Crest Vista Volunteer, Creston, IA	31
Judd, Francess, senior companion volunteer, Weber County, UT	4
Additional statement of Mrs. Judd	7
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts, prepared statement	91
Petito, Margaret L., prepared statement	93

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Articles, publications, etc.:	
Homeless and hungry found in worst plight, from the New York Times, January 22, 1986	35
Questions and answers:	
Responses by the administration to questions submitted by Committee	94

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE ACT OF 1973

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1986

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY,
DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:06 a.m., in room SD-430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Orrin Hatch (chairman of the full committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Hatch and Grassley.

Also present: Dr. Ronald F. Docksai, staff director, full committee.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR HATCH

Senator HATCH. I call the committee to order.

I must say that I have often seen Americans make great and real sacrifices for the public welfare, and I have noticed at least 100 instances in which they hardly ever failed to lend faithful support to one another.

This quotation by Alex de Toqueville, published in 1831, characterized his views of the people who comprised this developing Nation. His words still exemplify our commitment, the American tradition of helping one another, of leaning on one another, and of being with one another. Perhaps the best example of this is to look at America's volunteer network.

So it is with pleasure that I join with Senator Hawkins and others on this committee here today to review the reauthorization of ACTION, the Federal program whose wealth and spirit is primarily derived from our neighbors who volunteer their time and energies to help and support each other.

The programs that comprise ACTION provide a much-needed focal point for our Nation's volunteer workforce. ACTION's major programs include the Foster Grandparent Program, Volunteers in Service to America, or VISTA, the Retired Senior Volunteer Program, and the Senior Companion Program.

These programs help strengthen our country. Moreover, they represent people helping people—a senior citizen providing assistance and companionship to a homebound elderly woman; a young volunteer working to alleviate hunger in our most poverty-ridden neighborhoods; and an elderly person helping a child learn how to read. These are but a few examples of the ACTION volunteers' work.

Their services are beneficial to the recipient, however, their work also has a positive impact on the volunteers themselves.

Let me share with you this story about Mary Ellen, a widow from Ogden, UT. After her husband's death, Mary Ellen withdrew from the outside world. For 20 years, she avoided social activities, eventually disassociating herself from society. A concerned neighbor invited her to volunteer as a senior companion. At first, she only worked 2 hours a week, but soon, Mary Ellen was giving 20 hours of her time to weekly volunteer service.

Mary Ellen's job as a senior companion helped her gain back her self-esteem. As her positive self-image improved, so did the number of hours of her volunteer service. Currently, she is one of the program's most enthusiastic volunteers. Mary Ellen serves on the advisory board, and through her volunteer work, she assists an estimated 200 people each week.

True stories like these are common, and indeed they are success stories. Many senior citizens have discovered they have something to give, something to contribute. They unite together in an effort to help enable others to become more self-sufficient.

I was pleased to be the primary sponsor of the law enacted in 1984 that revised and updated the Federal ACTION programs. Through that law, we stimulated the use of more private sector resources and community volunteers. In addition, it also strengthened the administration of the program. Moreover, it enabled us to increase the number of senior companion volunteers so that more could participate and provide the valuable services needed by so many of our elderly homebound neighbors.

Senior Companions help make it possible for the homebound elderly to remain in their homes. Also, they help make it possible for some of the elderly placed in hospitals or nursing faciiities to return to and live in their own homes. I am a believer in the Senior Companion Program, and I know it works.

I am eager to hear and learn more about the impact of the 1984 law and to identify any other improvements in the Federal ACTION agency programs that might be suggested here today.

So it is with pride that I welcome here today Mrs. Frances Judd from Clearfield, UT, who will tell us about her work as a volunteer.

Mrs. Judd, you are the real expert on this bill because this is the work that you do on a very regular basis.

I might add that I have also heard about your outstanding service in the community. I know you are a caring and a warm individual.

I am certain that the elderly people that you help feel the energy and love that you bring to your work. Thank you for caring, and thank you for traveling all this way and for being willing to testify before this subcommittee. It means a lot to us.

We also welcome our friend, Donna Alvarado, the Director of the ACTION Agency. She has done a terrific job. She has provided the agency with exceptional leadership. In the short time that she has headed the agency, she has shown her heartfelt commitment to promoting and recognizing the utilization of volunteers as valuable community resources.

I think that each of us here today agree that volunteers are the backbone of our Nation, so we welcome all witnesses here today, and we appreciate the efforts they are putting forth to be with us.

Today, the members of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee will listen to the testimony, ask questions and reaffirm our support of and gratitude to America's many millions of volunteers. This is what America is all about, and this hearing, I hope, will help to bring that more in focus than before.

At this point we will enter into the record the opening statement of Senator Hawkins, the chairman of the subcommittee, who, unfortunately, is unable to be with us today.

[The opening statement of Senator Hawkins follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PAULA HAWKINS

Senator HAWKINS. Good morning. Today, the Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism meets to decide the future of ACTION. It is appropriate that we hold this hearing this week. On Monday we learned of the cuts that will come from the Gramm-Rudman amendment. On Tuesday, we heard the President's State of the Union Address. On Wednesday the President submitted his budget recommendations to Congress.

This is the first of many reauthorization hearings this subcommittee will hold in the coming months—during this time of Federal cutbacks. This is as good a time as any to let America know how this Senator plans to proceed.

If you ask this Senator, not one child will miss a meal because of budget cuts. If you ask this Senator, not one senior citizen will miss the opportunity for a companion in time of need because of budget cuts. If you ask this Senator, not one recovering teenage drug addict will be denied counseling because of budget cuts. These services are just too important.

It is significant that today we are examining ACTION. At a time when it seems to be dawning on everyone that Uncle Sam's deep pockets have bottomed out. Today, we meet to discuss the agency which leads all others in soliciting and tapping that increasingly important resource: volunteerism.

ACTION is number one in all of bureaucratic Washington in bringing the private sector into partnership with the public sector. And ACTION performs this service for the best of all possible goals—serving those less fortunate. As budget constraints force us to economize, I think all Federal programs could learn from ACTION's example of how to use volunteers.

That's the heart of the ACTION programs. The agency identifies a need. It recognizes the untapped volunteer resources ready and willing to respond to that need. Then it provides the necesary leadership and direction to mobilize these volunteer resources to provide an effective means of addressing human and social problems.

ACTION's purpose is to advocate, promote, and support the voluntary efforts of citizens in solving the problems of the poor, the disabled, the elderly and children with special needs. The common goal of ACTION's programs is to advocate and mobilize volunteer services as an effective means of addressing human and social problems.

I was recently appointed to the President's Child Safety Partnership. The purpose of this important body is to make recommendations to encourage and facilitate private sector involvement in child safety efforts. I would tell everyone today, we can learn a great deal from ACTION. In fact, ACTION was the pioneer in this field. Before the National Center For Missing and Exploited Children was established. Before the private sector was responding to the plight of missing children by displaying the pictures on milk cartons, envelopes and billboards. Before any of this—ACTION had sensed a desire on the part of the public to respond to the plight of missing children. And they did something about it. ACTION organized their Young-Volunteers-in-Action to compile and disseminate the Child Safety Booklet which provides volunteers with direction and assistance in organizing and sponsoring child safety programs.

That is just one, concrete example of the invaluable service ACTION provides to the Nation.

The witnesses testifying before us today are also good examples of the type of dedicated volunteers and the valuable programs which are found at ACTION.

Senator HATCH. With that, we are going to turn to Mrs. Judd. We will make you our first witness. And I may have to leave because of other conflicts. I have other committee mark-ups going on at this time. If I do, I am going to turn the gavel over to the Committee Chief of Staff, who will continue the hearing on our behalf today.

It is just one of those days when all of us are very harried, but I will do the best I can.

Mrs. Judd, we will turn the time over to you.

STATEMENT OF FRANCES JUDD, SENIOR COMPANION VOLUNTEER, WEBER COUNTY, UT

Mrs. JUDD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Hatch and committee members, my name is Frances Judd. I am a Volunteer Senior Companion in Weber County, UT.

I have been asked to speak to you about the Federally funded Senior Companion Program, what it means to me and to my clients.

I am only one of more than 6,200 Senior Companions in the United States. To be a Senior Companion, you must be 60 years of age and be of low income. You should be patient, caring, and sensitive to the needs of others. You should be a good listener and be willing to do whatever is needed.

Since we now have more senior citizens in our communities than ever before, programs like the Senior Companion Program are becoming vital to a growing population of our citizens.

I believe this program is effective in helping more of our Nation's elderly to be independent, and to be able to live in the dignity of their own homes rather than being moved into nursing homes. And this program also gives the Senior Companions the opportunity to be useful and productive to their fellow human beings.

At this time, I have six clients. Each one of those clients receives 2 to 4 hours a week that I devote exclusively to them. I take my clients to doctor appointments, and to get the medicine they re-

quire. If necessary, I even help them to remember when to take their medicine and how much. I help clients to make out their grocery lists and go shopping. We shop for food, clothes, presents, appliances, or whatever else they might need.

If they cannot get out, I do their shopping for them. But if they can get out, I go with them and help them. If the walking is too much for them, I even get a wheelchair to take them around, especially to the malls.

I write letters, address birthday cards and Christmas cards, and I see that they are mailed. Many of my clients enjoy having their hair fixed. I even gave a permanent once, and it turned out pretty good.

Sometimes, they just need to get out of the house and away from the monotony of the four walls. So I go out to lunch with them, and we visit.

Some of my clients are bedridden, so I read to them or I visit with them while their spouse takes a break from the constant nursing that is required.

Whenever one of my clients is hospitalized or is in a convalescent home for a while, I visit with them there, too. Although many of my clients who live alone have families nearby, the families are so busy they seldom have time to just visit with the elderly family member.

Family visits are usually spent taking care of specific problems. So I provide relief for the families and a listening post for my clients. I spend many hours listening to tales of younger years that no one else has time to listen to, or else they have heard it so often, they do not want to hear it again.

I become a friend and companion to my clients. I am someone to visit with and to do things with when no one else has time or patience. I try to help them feel good about themselves, to feel that they are still important and that someone cares.

I know that my clients consider my visit the bright spot in their otherwise lonely week, and as soon as I leave, they are anticipating my next visit. I have tried to bring friendship and loving understanding into my clients' lives. They in turn have enriched my life by letting me be of service to them.

I try to treat my clients as I would like to be treated, ever mindful that the day will come when I may well be the client, too.

I have been a Senior Companion for 4 years, with the exception of 4 months. In August 1983, I underwent a six bypass open heart surgery. I credit the annual physical checkups that the Senior Companions are required to have with my being here today.

So you see, for me, the Senior Companion Program has become a way of life. The stipend that I receive has made it possible for me, too, to live independently. It is due to this job that I can live in my own home and have my retarded son, Fred, living with me. It has also helped me to feel needed and has given me a purpose in life.

Besides the relationships with my clients, there are the friendships with other Senior Companions and with the staff of the Senior Companion Program. The staff provides for us in-service training meetings, recognition programs, picnics, Christmas programs, and activities such as the Senior Citizen Day at the Utah State Legislature.

Because of the Senior Companion Program, even at age 65, I can still experience the joy of giving of myself and of being productive. I am grateful for this opportunity, and I pray that this program will continue and will grow.

Hopefully, in 20 or so years when I need one, I can have a Senior Companion to help me through the week.

Thank you for listening to me.

[Additional statement of Mrs. Judd follows:]

21 February 1986

Dear Senator Hatch:

Since coming home from Washington, I have given some serious thought to your request that I make some suggestions on ways to improve and extend the services of Senior Companions. After writing down some ways, I realize I'm thinking of only a small minority of Senior Companions that might be able to provide these services. Also in Utah we have the Homemaker Program that provides many of these services.

Nevertheless, here are some suggestions. They would perhaps lead to different types of Senior Companions such as social, driver, or light nursing services. It would utilize all the abilities a Senior Companion might have.

I feel Senior Companions should be aware of all the services such as Medicaid, heat assistance and housing aid that might be available to clients and have a working knowledge of how to fill out applications or where to go to get help to fill out applications. They could be able to monitor blood pressure and blood sugar and report any abnormality to the clients physician. They could have a knowledge of how to give a bed bath and precautions to take in a shower or tub bath. They could be able to fix and assist with enemas or other personal necessary procedures. They could be able to prepare and administer injections for diabetes or oversee the clients administration. They could help and oversee mild forms of therapy as prescribed by a physician.

These are some of the things that I could perform and with a minimum amount of training I believe many Senior Companions could perform. Those that would perform these services could be determined on initial interview. In communities with no Homemaker Program these added services could be quite helpful.

Again, let me say, thank you for the privilege of representing the Senior Companions at your sub-committee meeting.

sincerely,

Frances Judd

Frances Judd
Senior Companion
Weber County

FJ/ce

Senator HATCH. Well, thank you.

I want you to know that I am very proud of you, and not only because you are from my State, but because of what you have been able to do. We have followed it, and we selected you to come because we think you are representative of Senior Companions all over the country, and I am very proud to wear this pin that you gave me this morning. I just want you to know that it means a lot to me. And we are very pleased that you can have your son with you. I think it is a wonderful program.

Let me just ask you one or two questions. When did you first hear about the Senior Companion Program?

Mrs. JUDD. Well, I came back to Utah from Texas in 1981. I was visiting with my sister's very dear friend, who had a senior companion, and she told me about it. I had had a stroke in 1980, and so I was a little bit incapacitated, and I could not take an 8-hour-a-day job. So I went to see about it, and even though I live in Davis County, they let me go into the Senior Companion Program.

Senator HATCH. I am glad they did, and I am surely glad that you were able to have that bypass surgery. You look great today, I will tell you.

Mrs. JUDD. Thank you.

Senator HATCH. Let me ask you this. What fate do you think would befall your clients if they were not served by a senior companion like yourself? Do you think that some of them, if not all of them, would be forced to enter nursing homes?

Mrs. JUDD. Well, I have not really kept track of how many clients I have had over the 4 years, but there are some that have had to go into nursing homes. I firmly believe that they would have had to go in a lot earlier.

Senator HATCH. I see; in your opinion, are you prohibited from providing any services that you think you should provide, or that you would like to provide to your companions?

Mrs. JUDD. Yes; in my case, I was a nurse, and there are many things that I could do for them that I am not allowed to do. This is a little difficult because there are things that just come naturally to me. But I try to abide by the rules.

Senator HATCH. Well, we appreciate that. You might want to take some time and write me a letter on things you think we might be able to improve this program with, especially in areas where you might be able to give a little extra assistance or a little extra effort—OK——

Mrs. JUDD. I would be glad to.

Senator HATCH [continuing]. Because you are right in the trenches. You are doing the job, and what a wonderful job you are doing, and people like you all over this country. It is exactly what President Reagan is talking about when we talk about volunteers, people who are willing to help their neighbors and their friends again, like we used to in the early days of this country, instead of expecting the Federal Government to provide every need and every concern.

You know, you can get the sterile government to provide a lot of things, but that still does not provide the love, and the affection, and the companionship that a program like this will help to provide.

So I just want to thank you for being here. I am very proud of you.

Mrs. JUDD. Thank you. I am very honored to be asked to be here.

Senator HATCH. Thank you for being with us, Mrs. Judd.

I am pleased today to welcome Ms. Donna Alvarado, the Director of the ACTION Agency. Accompanying Ms. Alvarado will be Mr. Rick Ventura, Deputy Director, and Dr. Dan Bonner, Associate Director of Domestic Operations.

I just want to say we are really happy to have you all appearing here today. Rick, it is good to see you again.

Mr. VENTURA. It is good to see you, Senator.

Senator HATCH. We appreciate all you do.

Ms. Alvarado, we are very proud of you. We are proud of the work you are doing, and we are very proud that this committee has tried to work closely with you, and we want to do whatever needs to be done in this area, so give us your advice, will you?

STATEMENT OF DONNA ALVARADO, DIRECTOR, ACTION AGENCY, ACCOMPANIED BY RICK VENTURA, DEPUTY DIRECTOR; DAN BONNER, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF DOMESTIC OPERATIONS, AND LOWELL GENEBACH, BUDGET OFFICER

Ms. ALVARADO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman

We certainly appreciate the support and the leadership that you have provided for all of our volunteer programs. As you indicated, it is the volunteers in the trenches who really are the ones who made ACTION's programs such a unique American success story. We feel that we can continue to improve these programs that we can expand the number of volunteers across America who are involved in ACTION's programs, and we are pleased to share that with you.

Mr. Chairman, we are very happy to be here before you today to discuss the reauthorization of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act, which established ACTION, the national volunteer agency.

ACTION, under this reauthorization, would continue to promote voluntary service by Americans for Americans.

My first year as Director of ACTION has convinced me that we can solve many of the challenges facing our communities if we fully develop available volunteer resources.

More than 400,000 citizens served as ACTION volunteers in fiscal year 1985. They contributed services worth over $350 million to our Nation, a return of almost 150 percent on each Federal dollar that was expended. But the true value of volunteers cannot be measured in dollars. When VISTA volunteers help women heading households end welfare dependency and enter the work force, when older volunteers teach illiterate citizens to read or help young people abandon drugs, our society gains in every way.

As President Reagan has said: "We can never fully measure the positive effects that each kind word or deed has upon this great and wonderful land."

To continue this essential work, the administration requests that the Domestic Volunteer Service Act be reauthorized for 3 years. In the administration's legislative proposal, which I will transmit to Congress shortly, the authorization request conforms to the Presi-

dent's fiscal year 1987 budget. For 1987, VISTA would be reauthorized at $17.89 million. Service learning activities would be reauthorized at $1.368 million, and citizen participation and demonstration activities would be reauthorized at $1.801 million.

For the Older American Volunteer Programs, the administration requests an authorized level for the Retired Senior Volunteer Program of $29.620 million. In the Foster Grandparent Program, we request $56.1 million; and for the Senior Companion Program, $18.086 million.

For administration and program support, the bill would authorize $25 million. The total authorization request for 1987 is $149.865 million.

For 1988 and 1989, the administration requests that the authorization language provide "such sums as may be necessary".

In addition, the administration bill includes several programmatic changes. We include a new preamble that specifies ACTION's responsibility for fostering voluntarism. The current act contains a statement of purpose for each title, but contains no general mission statement for the agency as a whole.

The administration bill would increase the local share contribution requirements in grants for the RSVP programs in the fourth and fifth year to 40 and 50 percent, respectively. This amendment would provide for local-share matching on a reasonable, shared basis and would achieve more efficient utilization of very limited Federal funds for one of our most outstanding programs.

The administration bill would clarify the Director's authority to develop private sector support for ACTION's programs. Our programs have demonstrated an outstanding return of value for each dollar appropriated. And Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to report that since 1981, the number of dollars used in matching ACTION grants have continued to increase in the private sector. There is a continued belief on the part of the American people, as I know the President indicated during his State of the Union Address, that the spirit of volunteering and charitable support is evergrowing in the country today, and we certainly feel those effects at ACTION.

Considering the recent efforts of the President and the Congress to balance the budget, Federal resources will be very limited in the future. This provision regarding private-sector support would allow the agency greater flexibility in the development of private-sector initiatives and enhanced support for volunteer programs.

Our draft bill includes an amendment that would reestablish the agency's advisory council which expired at the end of 1985. This is necessary because the ACTION Volunteer Advisory Council significantly contributed to the agency's ability to accomplish its mission. Moreover, the Council provided the agency more of an opportunity to garner community and private sector resources which in turn stimulate and motivate voluntarism.

And finally, our bill would make clear that the evaluation of programs should be scheduled according to need. The proposed amendment would require evaluations as the need arises. With this change, evaluation planning and implementation could be accomplished more efficiently and with a reduction in overall costs.

I urge the subcommittee and the committee to consider and enact the amendments contained in the administration bill. These

changes will enable ACTION to maintain volunteer levels and promote interest in voluntarism generally, despite shrinking Federal resources.

I would like to talk a bit about ACTION's Older American Volunteer Programs. They are authorized by title II of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act. Many older Americans and Members of Congress have expressed an interest in providing individuals who are not in a low-income category an opportunity to serve as nonstipended foster grandparents and senior companions. This might be a way to expand volunteer service without expanding Federal dollars, and it might assist local projects to utilize an untapped resource. We at ACTION are reviewing and studying this concept and look forward to further discussions on this issue. Our intention certainly is to preserve the existing volunteer service years in each of these programs and have no detrimental effect on stipended volunteers whatsoever.

At the same time, we want to be sure that there may be opportunities that are available to individuals who do not meet the income levels who would like to perform services such as or senior companions and foster grandparents are performing without stipends. So we will look into that.

In the Retired Senior Volunteer Program [RSVP] we sponsor 365,000 part-time, nonstipended volunteers age 60 and over. These innovative, enthusiastic volunteers contribute to the community in many ways—serving youth, operating runaway shelters, and emergency food banks, organizing support groups, and offering occupational counsel to juvenile offenders. We are expanding RSVP activities in literacy, crime prevention, in-home care, youth counseling, consumer education, and drug-abuse projects. RSVP is becoming increasingly involved in home health care as well.

A recent finding in an RSVP study by Booz Allen & Hamilton is that RSVP volunteers are better off socially, mentally, and physically than those who never served in the program. Those who remain active display levels of functioning which exceed those of volunteers who subsequently drop out of the program. I think this is a very tangible data base which shows that volunteering is just as good for the volunteer as it is for those who are served.

In addition, RSVP's history is replete with testimonials from community organization and agency staff, expressing their praises for the valuable and reliable services of RSVP volunteers, and this is attested to by the increasing amount of local financial support of project budgets, the increasing number of volunteers, and the increasing number of hours served.

In the Senior Companion Program during 1986, an estimated 6,200 senior companions in 112 projects including 900 volunteers in 16 non-ACTION-funded projects will serve some 24,000 persons in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. I think it is a testimonial to the success of the senior companion concept that States and localities have adopted the senior companion model and funded it purely with their own funds and no Federal dollars because they know that this model does work and that it provides independence and dignity for homebound elderly.

I would like to take this opportunity to report to you on the status of the implementation of the homebound, elderly provisions

which were included in the 1984 amendments to the Senior Companion Program.

We awarded $3,039,547 to support 912 new volunteers in 25 States and jurisdictions during the first operational year of the senior companion/homebound elderly effort. The additional senior companions eventually will serve some 3,325 older persons.

We also awarded a contract to design and implement a comprehensive evaluation of the five areas which you have specified in the law. The human impact of the program is conveyed well by the following statement of a client to her senior companion: "I know the doctor saved my life, but you gave me the courage to continue it."

The Foster Grandparent Program had nearly 19,000 foster grandparents in 259 community-based projects last year, including about 400 others in 10 non-ACTION-funded projects volunteered. On a typical day, approximately 66,000 children were served.

In Tampa, FL, for example, a number of foster grandparent volunteers worked with clinically identified abused and neglected children of preschool age. The volunteers provide one-on-one emotional support and assist in the delivery of educational programs to their assigned children. They also teach parenting skills to the parents of abused children. Volunteers in this area of service are assigned to programs run by a county child abuse council and county shelters for abused children.

The essence of the Foster Grandparent Program is direct, person-to-person relationships with the children served. Rewarding social, psychological, and educational benefits are gained by both the foster grandparent and the child. We have evaluations which show the very specific effects of the Foster Grandparent Program. All of the projects that I have visited, I see that those projects enable small miracles to happen every day in the lives of these children and these low-income older Americans.

VISTA, Volunteers in Service to America, ACTION's oldest program, has worked to alleviate poverty in America since 1964 by helping low-income individuals achieve self-sufficiency. In fiscal 1985, VISTA contributed 2,035 volunteer service-years to more than 500 communities.

VISTA volunteers live and work among the poor. More than half of the VISTA programs are youth oriented, addressing problems such as drug abuse, illiteracy, unemployment, hunger, runaways, and child abuse. For example, VISTA's in an eight-county area of southwestern Iowa are establishing a regional food bank and eight neighborhood food pantries. VISTA's also assist in developing an exposition that may help increase farm income in this afflicted area.

With regard to the future goals of ACTION, we will continue to carry out the President's mission of developing private sector initiatives while improving Federal management by wisely using each tax dollar and making Government more responsive to the American public. Our goals for the next 3 years include: to expand opportunities for volunteers to meet current and emerging needs in America's communities; to guide projects toward increased self-sufficiency, and to improve agency management, and to develop and sustain standards of excellence in existing programs.

America's volunteer spirit goes well beyond ACTION's core programs. We will tap the enormous resources our citizens offer. We will intensify and extend involvement with individuals, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and other Federal, State, and local governments to create new, lasting volunteer programs.

A major objective is to help community projects become self-sufficient. We must not create programs that fail when Federal funding ends. ACTION helps community projects get started and develop the operational excellence that attracts local funding. ACTION convenes public and private sector representatives to create new partnerships.

The ACTION record is a roadmap for the future. More than ever, America needs programs that build citizen independence and self-sufficiency, that establish cost-effective, lasting solutions through local voluntarism.

Reauthorization of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 will continue these efforts of people helping each other to solve community problems through voluntary citizen service.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Alvarado follows:]

TESTIMONY
OF
DONNA M. ALVARADO
DIRECTOR OF ACTION
SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS, AND ALCOHOL
FEBRUARY 6, 1986

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before you today to discuss reauthorization of the DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE ACT which established ACTION, the national volunteer agency. ACTION, under this reauthorization, would continue to promote voluntary service by Americans for Americans.

My first year as Director of ACTION has convinced me that we can solve many of the challenges facing our communities if we fully develop available volunteer resources.

More than 400,000 citizens served as ACTION Volunteers in Fiscal Year 1985. They contributed services worth over $350,000,000 to our nation, a return of almost 150% on our investment. But the true value of volunteers can't be measured only in dollars. When VISTA volunteers help women heading households end welfare dependency and enter the workforce, when older volunteers teach illiterate citizens to read or help young people abandon drugs, our society gains in every way. As President Reagan has said, "We can never fully measure the positive effects that each kind word or deed has upon this great and wonderful land."

ADMINISTRATION REQUEST

To continue this essential work, the Administration requests that the Domestic Volunteer Service Act be reauthorized for three years. In the Administration's legislative proposal, which I will transmit to Congress shortly, the authorization request conforms to the President's FY 1987 budget. For 1987, VISTA would be reauthorized at $17.89 million. Service Learning activities would be reauthorized at $1.368 million, and Citizen Participation and Demonstration activities would be reauthorized at $1.801 million.

For the Older American Volunteer Programs, the Administration requests an authorized level for the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) of $29.620 million. In the Foster Grandparent Program (FGP), we request $56.1 million. For the Senior Companion Program (SCP), we request $18.086 million.

For administration and program support, the bill would authorize $25 million. The total authorization request for 1987 is $149.865 million.

For FY 1988 and FY 1989 the Administration requests that the authorization language provide "such sums as may be necessary".

In addition, the Administration bill includes several programmatic changes. It will include a new preamble that specifies ACTION's responsibility for fostering voluntarism. The current act contains a statement of purpose for each Title, but contains no general mission statement for the agency as a whole.

The Administration bill would increase the local share contribution requirements in grants for the RSVP programs in the fourth and fifth year to 40% and 50% respectively. The current legislation provides for 30% local contribution in the third and subsequent years of the grant. This amendment would provide for local-share matching on a reasonable, shared basis and would achieve more efficient utilization of very limited federal funds. Currently, the combination of Section 224 and the 30% maximum contribution is a disincentive to greater involvement of local resources.

The Administration bill would clarify the Director's authority to develop private sector support for ACTION's programs. Our programs have demonstrated an outstanding return of value for each dollar appropriated. Considering the recent efforts of the President and Congress to balance the budget, federal resources will be limited in the future. This provision would allow the Agency greater flexibility in the development of private sector initiatives and enhanced support for volunteer programs.

Our draft bill includes an amendment that would re-establish the Agency's Advisory Council which expired at the end of 1985. This is necessary because the ACTION Volunteer Advisory Council significantly contributed to the Agency's ability to accomplish its mission. Moreover, the Council provided the Agency more of an opportunity to garner community and private sector resources which, in turn, stimulate and motivate volunteerism.

And finally, our bill would make clear that the evaluation of programs should be scheduled according to need. The proposed amendment would require evaluations as the need arises. With this change, evaluation planning and implementation would be accomplished more efficiently, and with a reduction in overall costs.

I urge the Subcommittee to consider and enact the amendments contained in the Administration bill. These changes will enable ACTION to maintain volunteer levels and promote interest in voluntarism generally, despite shrinking federal resources.

I would like to share with the Subcommittee the accomplishments of our programs over the past year and our plans for the future.

OLDER AMERICAN VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

ACTION's Older American Volunteer Programs are authorized by Title II of the DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE ACT. Some look at the so-called "greying of America" and see rising health-care costs. I see a great untapped resource of new volunteers. In FY 1985, tens of thousands of retired Americans served their communities through our three Older American Volunteer Programs -- the Retired Senior Volunteer, Foster Grandparent and Senior Companion Programs. These programs represent the most innovative, cost-effective and promising means we have of putting the experience of older citizens to work for America.

Many older Americans and Members of Congress have expressed an interest in providing individuals who are not in a low-income category an opportunity to serve as non-stipended Foster Grandparents and Senior Companions. This might be a way to expand volunteer service without expanding federal dollars, and it might help local projects to utilize an untapped resource. We at ACTION are reviewing and studying this concept.

FOSTER GRANDPARENT PROGRAM

Since 1965 the Foster Grandparent Program has matched low-income seniors with children who have special or exceptional needs. Foster Grandparent volunteers work in schools for mentally retarded, disturbed, and learning-disabled children; in Head Start Programs; in juvenile detention centers; in boarding schools and foster care homes; and in some cases in a child's home.

Last year, nearly 19,000 Foster Grandparents in 259 community-based projects, including about 400 others on 10 non-ACTION funded projects volunteered. On a typical day, approximately 66,000 children were served.

In Tampa, Florida, for example, a number of Foster Grandparent volunteers work with clinically-identified abused and neglected children of pre-school age. The volunteers provide one-on-one emotional support and assist in the delivery of educational programs to their assigned children. They also teach parenting skills to the parents of abused children. Volunteers in this area of service are assigned to programs run by a County Child Abuse Council and County Shelters for Abused Children.

The essence of the Foster Grandparent Program is direct, person-to-person relationships with the children served. Rewarding social, psychological, and educational benefits are gained by both the Foster Grandparent and the child. Last year we funded five new projects and expanded 23 existing ones.

SENIOR COMPANION PROGRAM

Since 1974 low-income Senior Companions have helped thousands of their peers maintain independent living. The Senior Companion Program is on the cutting edge of programs designed to assist frail elderly Americans preserve dignity and independence in their lives. Senior Companions provide personal support to homebound older persons who are at risk of institutionalization. These older American volunteers are trained in personal care, nutrition, home management, and personal representation. Their home care services augment professional and paraprofessional care, providing the extra support that allows older persons with physical, mental, or emotional impairments to remain at home and carry out daily activities.

In fiscal year 1986, an estimated 6,200 Senior Companions in 112 projects, including 900 volunteers in 16 non-ACTION funded projects, will serve some 24,000 persons in the fifty states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Fourteen percent of all SCP projects are non-ACTION funded. Local projects that wish to affiliate with ACTION, whether it be with SCP, FGP, or RSVP, raise the funds locally and sign an agreement with the Agency stating that they will follow the Agency's legislation and guidelines. They in turn use the national program name, logo, and materials and receive technical assistance. ACTION is affiliated with 38 such projects. The Agency has asked the Regional and State Offices to include as a goal in their operating plans the expansion of non-ACTION funded projects. We feel there is great receptivity at the local and state level, particularly with SCP.

I would like to take this opportunity to report the status of the implementation of the homebound elderly provisions included in the 1984 Amendments to the Senior Companion Program. In order to expand efforts in this area, 10 - 15 volunteer service years were added to 17 existing projects, a total of 189 volunteer seervice years. In addition, 19 new projects, ranging from 21 to 65 volunteer service years each, were awarded for an eventual total of 847 volunteer service years.

The expansion of on-going projects and the new projects will incorporate the new features of the law. Community volunteer professionals will train and support volunteers, with assistance from experienced Senior Companions. Trained volunteers will serve in acute-care discharge and respite-care settings and assist psychologically disabled elderly, homebound elderly living alone, terminally ill and elderly with substance abuse problems.

We awarded $3,039,547 to support 912 new volunteers in 25 States and jurisdictions during the first operational year of the SCP Homebound Elderly effort. The additional Senior Companions eventually will serve some 3,625 older persons. We have also awarded a contract to design and implement a comprehensive evaluation of the five areas specified in the law.

RETIRED SENIOR VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

The Retired Senior Volunteer Program, is ACTION's largest program. It sponsors 365,000 part-time, non-stipended volunteers aged 60 and over. They serve through non-profit organizations and local public agencies in more than one-third of the nation's counties. RSVP volunteers contribute to the community in many ways -- serving youth, operating runaway-shelters and emergency food banks, organizing support groups and offering occupational counseling to juvenile offenders. In fiscal year 1985, these dynamic older Americans performed more than 68,000,000 hours of voluntary citizen service.

This year we are expanding RSVP activities in literacy, crime prevention, in-home care, youth counseling, consumer education, and drug abuse projects. In fiscal year 1985, 38,500 RSVP volunteers were involved in home health care activities. By the end of this fiscal year, the number of volunteers involved will increase to more than 48,000. RSVP will become increasingly involved in home health care.

RSVP volunteers also serve as members of support groups to victims of stroke, heart attack, alcohol and drug abuse.

I would like, at this point, to report on the additional $1.8 million appropriation received in Fiscal Year 1985 for RSVP for expansion. The funds created 28 new projects and expanded the activities of 191 existing projects. Nearly 18,000 new volunteers are expected to fill opportunities for service that otherwise would not have existed.

ACTION set aside $100,000 of the expansion funds for a special adult-literacy effort in partnership with Laubach Literacy Action, B. Dalton Bookseller, Inc., and the National RSVP Project Directors' Association. Laubach has made 23 small literacy incentive awards to RSVP projects for a one-year period beginning in October, 1985 and is providing technical assistance to all RSVP projects involved in this important area. Although it is too soon to predict the results of this literacy initiative, we are optimistic that it will become a model for future public/private partnerships.

VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

VISTA, Volunteers in Service to America, ACTION's oldest program, has worked to alleviate poverty in America since 1964 by helping low-income individuals achieve self-sufficiency. VISTA volunteers are assigned to public and private non-profit organizations throughout the United States. In fiscal year 1985, VISTA contributed 2,035 volunteer service years to more than 500 communities.

VISTA fosters long-term, working relationships among sponsor organizations, the communities, and the private sector. Sponsors are encouraged to secure private sector support and recruit part-time local volunteers so that projects can keep going after federal assistance ends.

VISTA volunteers, one third of whom are low-income, live and work among the poor. More than half the VISTA programs are youth-oriented, addressing problems such as drug abuse, illiteracy, unemployment, hunger, runaways, and child abuse.

Volunteers are also active in neighborhood revitalization, economic development, refugee settlement, shelters for the homeless and food banks.

For example, VISTAs in an eight-county area of Southwestern Iowa are establishing a regional food bank and eight neighborhood food pantries. VISTAs also assist in developing an exposition that may help increase farm income.

SERVICE LEARNING AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

One of ACTION's principal objectives in expanding voluntarism in the U.S. is to develop a greater commitment on the part of American youngsters to our democratic and free society; every citizen - young and old - should be given the opportunity to contribute time and talent to their communities and the nation. ACTION continues to emphasize youth and work with business and corporate communities to increase their partnerships with young people.

ACTION's National Center for Service Learning provides training, resources, and technical assistance to high school, college and community organizations that develop service-learning volunteer programs. The Center also provides assistance to existing local volunteer programs.

ACTION also funded efforts by Big Brothers/Big Sisters to widen the scope of their well-established program.

The Young Volunteers in ACTION program was developed by ACTION in 1981 as a model for students age 14 to 22. Volunteers gain leadership skills as they serve in community projects. As of this fiscal year, students have given more than 1.5 million hours of service.

ACTION's demonstration grants have enabled communities to test and replicate innovative approaches to solving such chronic social problems as drug abuse, unemployment, and at-risk youth by developing effective volunteer efforts.

STATE OFFICE OF VOLUNTARY CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

The State Office of Voluntary Citizen Participation program was created in 1974. Since that date, forty-fiwe states and Puerto Rico have received grants to establish offices, frequently within the office of the governor, to support state and local volunteer programs. The offices offer numerous services including technical assistance, training, materials, and

conferences. The program is so successful that 33 of the offices are operating independently, while seven currently receive ACTION funding.

FUTURE GOALS

ACTION will continue to carry out the President's mission of developing private sector initiatives, while improving federal management by wisely using each tax dollar and making government more responsive to the American public. Our goals for the next three years are: (1) to expand opportunities for volunteers to meet current and emerging needs in America's communities; (2) to guide projects toward increased self-sufficiency; and (3) to improve agency management.

America's volunteer spirit goes well beyond ACTION's core programs. We will tap the enormous resources our citizens offer. We will intensify and extend involvement with individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, and other federal, state and local governments to create new, lasting volunteer programs.

A major objective is to help community projects become self-sufficient. We must not create programs that fail when federal funding ends. ACTION helps community projects get started and develop the operational excellence that attracts local funding. ACTION convenes public and private sector representatives to create new partnerships.

The ACTION record is a roadmap for the future. More than ever America needs programs that build citizen independence and self-sufficiency -- that estabish cost-effective, lasting solutions through local voluntarism. Reauthorization of the DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE ACT of 1973 will continue these efforts of people helping to solve community problems

Senator HATCH. Thank you, Ms. Alvarado.

I was pleased in 1984 to sponsor the legislation that provided for the increased emphasis in the home care element of the Senior Companion Program.

Would you provide the committee at this time with a status report on the implementation of that particular provision? I am very interested in it. I want to know how it is working to see if it is ontrack and whether we should continue to fight as hard as we have for home health care.

Ms. ALVARADO. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The annualized level available for the new Senior Companion/Homebound Elderly component is $3,353,000. Of this amount, $2,760,000, or 82 percent, funds 17 new projects and provides 847 volunteer service years, and $593,000, or 18 percent, funds 17 additional components to continuing projects which provide for 189 volunteer service years.

Mr. Chairman, we recently brought into town the project directors for the new Homebound Elderly programs and components. I am pleased to report to you that there is a tremendous amount of enthusiasm, and energy being expended on behalf of this program. People are committed to its success. I believe as you have heard, this program is already beginning to achieve these goals.

We have volunteers in the new Home Health Care Demonstration Program. Their role is to supplement the formal home health care system by providing peer counseling and social support on a one-to-one basis to older persons who lack the active support of family and friends.

Mr. Chairman, I know that you are aware of the demographic situation facing this country in the next 20 years, the fact that America is graying, that the largest percentage of the population

will be senior citizens by the end of the century. We feel that the Senior Companion Program and particularly this demonstration will provide a roadmap and a model for the future that will really brighten the lives of many Americans now, as well as in the future.

Senator HATCH. OK. What are your priorities for the distribution of part C discretionary funds? Could you tell us about that?

Ms. ALVARADO. Yes. In order to maximize the limited amount we have in the ACTION discretionary funds, we believe it is important to maintain flexibility in determining how these moneys will be spent. These are basically research and development moneys. We believe that we can best utilize these funds to develop new approaches with other Federal agencies as well as with local grantees in determining how best to mobilize volunteers to meet emerging needs in the communities, and in testing new approaches to voluntarism. So we will continue to utilize these moneys as R&D tools.

I would like to share some examples. During the first and second quarters of 1986, ACTION has funded the following demonstrations: $23,000 to the American Council for Drug Education in Rockville, MD; $23,000 to the Texas Rio Grande Valley Chamber of Commerce; $49,000 to the Lutheran Social Services of Jacksonville, FL, a demonstration project to enable low-income refugees, particularly refugee women, to become self-sufficient by training them in daycare activities; and $49,000 to the State of Delaware for the fifth and final year of the State Office of Voluntary Citizen Participation.

We have emphasized drug education and prevention efforts across the country. We have utilized demonstration grants to fund literacy, youth-oriented, refugees and programs. Now we are looking into the possibility of doing additional demonstration programs in assisting afflicted farmers around parts of the country who need that assistance, as well as in the Rio Grande Valley.

Senator HATCH. OK. It has come to my attention that while the administration's proposal for the reauthorization has not yet been received by Congress that you are interested in proposals to provide for nonstipend volunteers in some of the older American volunteer programs. Could you please provide us the rationale for this particular initiative, and further, how do you answer concerns that these nonstipend volunteers may erode recruitment of stipend volunteers?

Ms. ALVARADO. Well, let me say very plainly at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that in our exploration of the non-stipended option, we are very much committed to fully maintaining the existing levels of volunteer service years' for our stipended volunteers. We do not see that the addition of non-stipended volunteers would hamper the existing levels of stipended volunteers.

What we have seen in a number of projects is that in some areas where there may be a Foster Grandparent Program, there are senior citizens who do not meet the low-income requirement who very much want to serve as Foster Grandparents, but, by law, they are prohibited from doing so. These individuals have indicated that they do not want a stipend, that they would do this for free, and yet they are still not allowed to participate.

So it would be in these situations, on a case-by-case basis, administered very judiciously so as not to affect the recruitment of sti-

pended volunteers or the numbers of stipended volunteers, that we would explore this option. It would enable us to serve the many children who have needs, the many homebound elderly who continue to require assistance, knowing that we only have limited resources for stipended volunteers.

I would also say, Mr. Chairman, that we have very successfully used RSVP's in a number of these areas, and to the extent practical, we will be committed to continuing to provide nonstipended volunteers for these activities through RSVP. But in some areas of the country, we do not have RSVP programs, where we do have Foster Grandparent and Senior Company programs.

I look forward to discussing this further with the committee, and certainly with our project directors, associations, and all interested project directors.

Senator HATCH. Well, thank you. I appreciate your testimony today, Ms. Alvarado, and we appreciate the efforts you make, and I said that at the outset. But I really am very proud of this program. And I have had to learn a lot about it as I have served in the Senate. It is one that really is doing a good job, and it has got to give you a great deal of pride and satisfaction to work in an entity like this.

Ms. ALVARADO. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much. On behalf of the entire ACTION staff and all of our volunteers and project directors, we do appreciate your personal leadership and support for all of our programs.

I did not initially introduce my colleagues at the table, and I would like to do so at this time. Rick Ventura, our Deputy Director; Dan Bonner, our Associate Director for Domestic Operations, and Lowell Genebach, our Budget Officer.

Senator HATCH. We are happy to have all four of you here today. We appreciate the work you are all doing. I just do not know of another program that brings as much satisfaction.

There are a lot of programs. We work with the handicapped—yesterday, this committee appeared before the Rules Committee. And of course, everybody is concerned about Gramm-Rudman and cutting back and so forth. And they were quite shocked at the budget of this committee. But I think the shock kind of dissipated when they realized we have upward of 3,000 Federal programs that we have to administer and overview in this committee, and we do have a large staff. And as large as it is, it still is not large enough to take care of all of these programs, most all of which have been refined through the years to be efficient, cost-effective, worthwhile, and we think loving programs. And these are all the handicapped programs, all the alcohol and drug abuse programs, the programs that you have been talking about today—I mean, it has brought a great deal of joy to be able to work on these people-saving programs, and yours are very, very important in my eyes, and I just want to thank all of you for the work that you have done on behalf of Members of Congress. We really feel deep gratitude to have people like you serving in our Government today, and I just want to thank you.

Ms. ALVARADO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator HATCH. Thank you for being here.

Now we will be happy to welcome a panel of volunteers throughout the country. We have already heard from Mrs. Judd, from my own home State of Utah.

We have here today Mrs. Daisy Martin, a Foster Grandparent from Fort Lauderdale, FL. And I would also like to welcome two VISTA volunteers: Ira Greiff, who works with St. Francis House, in Boston, MA, and Sister Jean Goering, of Creston IA, a Med-Crest VISTA volunteer.

I think we will begin with you, Mr. Greiff, and then we will go to Mrs. Martin and finally to Sister Jean Goering.

I have to apologize to you, because I have to go to another meeting. So I am going to ask counsel of the full committee, Dr. Ronald Docksai, to continue this hearing and make this excellent and absolutely essential testimony become part of our record, so that we can reauthorize this bill and do so with the full record backing it up.

So if you would do that, Dr. Docksai, I would appreciate it.

[Whereupon, Dr. Ronald Docksai, committee staff director, assumed the Chair.]

Dr. DOCKSAI. Please proceed, Mr. Greiff.

STATEMENT OF IRA GREIFF, PROJECT DIRECTOR, ST. FRANCIS HOUSE, BOSTON, MA; DAISY MARTIN, FOSTER GRANDPARENT VOLUNTEER, FORT LAUDERDALE, FL, AND SISTER JEAN GOERING, MED-CREST VISTA VOLUNTEER, CRESTON, IA

Mr. GREIFF. I am pleased to appear before you today to discuss reauthorization of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act.

I am coexecutive director and project director of St. Francis House, which is a rehabilitation center for homeless people. This is a multiservice program where we try to deal with the many unmet needs of the homeless. We have 25 on our staff, 10 of whom are VISTA volunteers. We have a lunch program. We are open 7 days a week. We have a lunch program where we serve a nutritious lunch. We have free clothing. We have medical care. We have counseling for personal problems and also for possible benefits to which a person may be entitled.

In addition, we have a day program. This is a program where people who wander the streets after they have either been at a shelter or have been outside can have a place to be during the day, a home during the day, where they can socialize with other homeless people, socialize with our volunteers, and perhaps receive some service.

One of the major goals we have at St. Francis House is to foster a caring and accepting attitude, to build trust with people who have become very estranged from the mainstream of American life.

One of our goals has been to reduce the fragmentation and difficulty of access to resources in the community. So, we at St. Francis House have representatives of the major State agencies—welfare, mental health, and we also have a representative of the Social Security Agency who comes once a week to St. Francis House.

We have also got, as I mentioned, a medical clinic. We have our own nurse practitioner, but we also are host in our clinic to Health Care for the Homeless, which is a program funded in 18 cities by

the Pew Memorial Trust and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

We also network with public and private sector agencies; the jobs and housing specialists that we have do that. We have 230 community volunteers who help us in delivering these services.

Now, what is the role of the VISTA volunteers in this program? Well, as I mentioned 40 percent of our staff are VISTA volunteers. I want to emphasize, though, that that is only 16 percent of our operating budget. So this is a very, very valuable contribution, but it does not comprise more than 16 percent of the budget.

These VISTA volunteers are involved in the delivery of essential services. The coordinator for food of the kitchen and the dining room is a VISTA volunteer. The coordinators for clothing are VISTA volunteers. We have a volunteer who is involved in the counseling I mentioned. The coordinator of all of these community volunteers is also a VISTA volunteer.

I neglected to mention that we have a certified alcohol counselor on the staff and also a psychiatric nurse who is funded by the National Institute of Mental Health. In addition, we brought the Research and Training Center in mental health at Boston University. We have a 5-year agreement with them to train the staff in the theory and practice of psychiatric rehabilitation. Basically, they are there to help teach our staff skills in coordination of resources and mobilization of resources. And they are also there to train the staff to, in turn, help our homeless people cope better with their lives, and perhaps develop goals in the areas of living, working, and learning.

We have a coordinator of the day program, as I mentioned, who is a VISTA volunteer. We could not function without VISTA volunteers. Our success is directly attributable to their presence. If we lost some slots, we would lose essential services.

They do a wonderful job. They are very innovative, energetic people.

I would like to turn now to some recommendations about the program. We had to recruit our own VISTA people, and that was a tremendous investment of time and money. And I feel that this constitutes an undue burden on us and other agencies. My feeling is that there should be a national pool developed by VISTA to recruit possible candidates for VISTA. In that way people, not necessarily from our locality, who would want to work in our program, could potentially be available to us.

I also feel that there should be a better mix, a more heterogeneous mix of people in VISTA than there is right now. I understand it is not at all that common for young people to be in VISTA any longer. I feel that a public relations effort should be made on campuses and in similar facilities to recruit a more diverse group—young, middle-aged, elderly, and also from diverse racial and ethnic groups.

I think there is insufficient networking among VISTA volunteers in a region. My VISTA volunteers do not know what other VISTA volunteers are doing in the same locality. I think there should be meetings where there is communication and people get to know each other.

I think there is a very weak identity on the part of my volunteers with VISTA as a national organization. They do not have an adequate sense of the VISTA mission. They have a sense of identity with us, but not particularly with VISTA. I think again, there should be more emphasis on a sense of mission, at least as I have found it, that would be instilled in either preservice, inservice, or ongoing activities by VISTA administrators.

I want to say that this in no way reflects on my relationship with William Cosby who is the local director; he has been terrific in collaborating with me, and we have a very good working relationship. My criticisms or my suggestions have to do with national policies around the VISTA Program.

I also feel that VISTA volunteers should be funded at the poverty level, not below the poverty level. Right now, I realize that VISTA volunteers live and work with people who, let us say, are low income. But the fact is that right now, VISTA volunteers are getting somewhat below the poverty level. And in times of high living costs, I think they should be at that level.

I want to mention some of the suggestions about funding, about using the private sector. I am very much opposed to that. I am opposed to it because it is an abdication of the responsibility of the Federal Government to the poor and homeless of America. Also, an agency like ours that works with the poor, we have got to compete then with VISTA——

Dr. DOCKSAI. Just for clarification, if I could ask, this would be for both profit and nonprofit organizations, volunteers? For example, the Sisters of Charity and other nonprofit organizations which make volunteers available, under the IRS Code, would be considered private. But I think you are talking about just for-profit organizations?

Mr. GREIFF. Yes, I am talking about for profit, and I am opposed to that because I feel that we would then be competing for funds in our localities with VISTA efforts to raise money from the private sector. There is enough competition around. We do not need more competition from VISTA.

I feel that VISTA is a marvelous, effective, antipoverty program with a very good track record, and it is a corrective to the slashing of domestic programs. And because of that, I feel that it is the Government's responsibility in the time of crisis in homelessness and hunger to fund the program adequately, given the acknowledged fact that it has been so efficient and so effective.

I am also opposed to nonstipended volunteers in VISTA. I feel that what I see of our workers, they do difficult skilled work, and I think that part of our American tradition aside from the tradition of volunteerism is that people get paid for the work that they do when it is difficult and skilled.

I also feel the principle, once it gets going, of having nonstipended VISTA volunteers, could gradually lead to—the principle violated of getting a stipend—could lead, I think, to a diminution of the funding. I really do not see this as a positive step.

As far as recommendations, programmatic recommendations or budget recommendations, I am in favor of an expanded VISTA budget to $21 million, to take care of what I mentioned before—the fact that there is not enough of a public relations effort to recruit a

more heterogeneous mix of people. I think there should be more VISTA volunteers. I really think that if you look at the evidence, we are having an increase in hunger and homelessness in cities, and VISTA doing the great job it does in its cost-efficient way, I think we should have more VISTA volunteers.

As far as cutting is concerned, I would regret any cutting of the VISTA Program, but if there did have to be cutting, I would favor cutting the discretionary or projects money, because these are projects whose value is yet to be validated. And I feel that with the crisis we are in, we should stick with a proven program that has delivered the goods and will continue to do so.

I would also like to submit an article which appeared in the New York Times which validates my contention that there is a rise in homelessness and hunger. This is a news report about the U.S. Conference of Mayors meeting that would document this contention of mine that we need additional funding, not just to maintain the present level of program and funding.

Thank you.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Hearing no objection, that will be added to the official hearing record.

[Information supplied for the record follows:]

NY TIMES 1-22-86

Homeless and Hungry Found in Worse Plight

WASHINGTON, Jan. 21 (AP) — Demands for emergency food and shelter rose sharply in most of 25 surveyed cities last year, and in many cases hungry and homeless people were turned away because there was not enough to go around, the United States Conference of Mayors reported today.

A survey of officials in the 25 cities in the United States and Puerto Rico said that in nearly all the cities the national economic recovery had failed to ease local poverty problems.

"Low benefits in public assistance programs, poverty and unemployment problems lead the list of reasons for the persistence of hunger," said the report by the conference's study group on hunger and the homeless. The panel was headed by Mayor Raymond L. Flynn of Boston.

The mayors reported that demand for emergency food rose on the average 28 percent in the cities in 1985 and that in all but two of the cities there was an increase in the number of families requesting emergency food.

Demands for shelter increased in 56 percent of the cities and lessened in none.

Two out of three cities reported that they must turn people away from their emergency food assistance programs. The officials estimated that 17 percent of demand for the food went unmet.

More than half the cities reported that homeless people were routinely or occasionally turned away from emergency shelters because they were full.

The report was released as mayors of the nation's major cities gathered in Washington for their annual winter meeting and to press their case before Congress for continued Federal spending on domestic programs.

Several of the mayors are to testify Wednesday before a House subcommittee hearing on urban problems. They included Ernest N. Dutch Morial New Orleans, president of the conference; George V. Voinovich of Cleveland, a Republican who has been a frequent critic of the Reagan Administration, and Harold Washington of Chicago.

Chief Justice Warren E. Burger will address the mayors, and Mayor Koch of New York will speak on trying to renew for the nineties a 25-year Federal program of general revenue sharing, which is to end this year.

The nation's mayors have often voiced concern that Federal budget-cutting efforts will bring an end to programs that aid the cities.

Homeless Families With Children

Increases in the number of families with children needing food and housing aid were noted in the report. For example, New York City reported that 66 percent of its homeless were families with children. In neighboring Yonkers, the figure was 56 percent.

The 25 cities were selected because the mayor of each served on the study group.

Most cities said poverty remained the same or increased in 1985.

Cities reporting that hungry people were turned away routinely or occasionally were New York, Yonkers, Boston, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Kansas City, Mo., Louisville, Ky., Nashville, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Phoenix, San Juan, Salt Lake City, Seattle and Trenton.

Cities reporting that homeless people were turned away routinely or occasionally were Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Kansas City, Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, Phoenix, St. Paul, Minn., San Francisco, San Juan, Seattle and Yonkers.

35

Dr. DOCKSAI. Mr. Greiff, before we turn to Mrs. Martin, let me at the outset thank you for both your thoughtful testimony as well as for your patience and graciousness.

We are in a very unusual situation here in light of Senator Hatch having to temporarily leave, and Senator Hawkins not being able to be with us this morning.

I should note for the record—for those who have not been in this kind of situation—that the rules of procedure governing all hearings of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources are outlined subject to rule 26, paragraph 5, of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The guidelines for the operation of hearings make allowance for senior staff to receive testimony on behalf of the chairman. But in doing that, it is the responsibility of all staff here to tell our respective Senators what happened this morning, to give them the testimony, and to go over this in the same fashion we would with any other hearing.

So, that having been said, thank you again for your graciousness. Senator Hatch, and Senator Hawkins, and the other members of the committee on both sides of the aisle share the sense of urgency for the need to reauthorize ACTION. That is why we did not want to put off today's hearing. And we would like to proceed so that we can thoughtfully, but expeditiously, proceed to the subcommittee for markup at a later time.

So, we will now turn to you, Mrs. Martin, and thank you very much.

Mrs. MARTIN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Mrs. Martin, and I am here to represent the Foster Grandparent Program.

It is indeed an honor for me to have been asked by you to come here and testify in behalf of this great program and to tell you how I first came to be involved with the program.

The key word is "love." I would just like to tell you a little about my past as a child, why I am so dedicated to children today. I, too, was an abused child in my family, and I know what it is to be left out, to feel unloved, to be abused, and to be the underdog. That is why I am so dedicated to children today.

I first came to know about foster grandparents in about 1970. I had a friend working with the program, and she was always telling me about what a great program it was and how she enjoyed working with the program. So I became interested, and I asked her how could I get to enroll in the program. She told me how to enroll. When I called the office, they asked me how old I was. I told them I was 54. They said, "Wait a little longer until you get a little older, and then call back."

I kept this in mind for several years. When I came of age, 60, I called back. They told me to come down and enroll and fill out the application, and I did. I put on my application that I wanted to work with children, because I had always said that I would never mistreat a child or abuse children, knowing how I was abused when I was a child. So that attitude just grew in me as I grew older.

I am working at the Walker Elementary School in Fort Lauderdale. I help with second- and third-grade children. I work with four children on a daily basis.

The Foster Grandparent Program is a fantastic, outstanding program. It provides opportunities for all low-income older people who want to get out of their rocking chairs and want to get out from behind the walls of their homes and go out in the community and the neighborhood and be active, and give service, and make themselves useful. It is a wonderful program.

I do not know all the history and background of the program, but whoever it was who had the vision to put such a fantastic program together to help older people, had to have had an inspiration from God.

We like to be useful. We like to feel needed. We like to go out and share our love with mankind. And that is the source of the success of the Foster Grandparent Program—older people helping themselves and helping others to help themselves—the children. We have foster grandparents working in child-abuse shelters, drug-abuse shelters, day-care nurseries, women in distress, kids in distress, and runaway shelters. We have foster grandparents working in all of the elementary schools, giving of themselves and giving their time and their love, sharing their love, and their time, and their energy with children.

I do not know what I would do with myself if I were not working with the Foster Grandparent Program. Being too old to go out and work in the private sector, this program provides a wonderful opportunity for me, and I know for all of the other low-income people, too. I speak not only for myself, but I speak for all the other foster grandparents. I know that it makes them feel good to be needed and to feel useful.

The stipend, it comes in handy. It makes us independent, knowing that we can earn a paycheck and we do not have to be dependent on our children. Most of us have no other income but our Social Security checks, and by us being able to serve on this program and work with other people, and to help children, and to receive a stipend, it makes us independent. We do not have to depend on our children or on welfare.

I know if I were not working with the Foster Grandparents Program, with that stipend coming in between the time we get those Social Security checks, that I would have to go to my children for help and I don't want to do that. But that small stipend is a big help. You just do not know how it helps to make ends meet. It is a wonderful thing for us to have this opportunity to do this type of work for children.

Also, there is much need for other volunteers in this program. I think about the little children, the babies that are being battered, sexually molested, and sexually abused. But I believe if we would open up some other opportunities for day-care nurseries and centers, and let older people—like foster grandparents—who want to work, and want to get out, and help, and feel needed, and if we would put stipended older people into these day-care centers and let them take care of those babies and those little children, I believe it would cut down so much of the abuse and sexual abuse of children.

So I think it is a wonderful program, and I am very happy to be invited here at this time to testify and to speak in behalf of our

Foster Grandparent Program. I hope I have said some things that will be of some good and be of some use.

I will close with, my favorite quotation: "Never has a man stood so tall as when he stoops to help a child."

Thank you.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Thank you, Ms. Martin. You exemplify, I know all the Senators on the committee believe, much more than Fort Lauderdale, but the fine work being done across the country. It is very gracious of you to come and to share that with us. We will make sure our respective Senators know that.

Before turning to a few questions we have from our respective Senators, I turn to Sister Goering.

Sister GOERING. Thank you for the opportunity to testify before this group today.

I am a VISTA supervisor in a 10-county area—Donna earlier said it was 8-county; it has been expanded to 10 since we started. And I work with specifically the rural economic crisis in the 10-county area in southwest Iowa.

I have a short prepared statement. I think I will just read that and make a few comments as I go.

VISTA workers in this project are serving the needs of rural people in 10 southwestern counties in Iowa who are experiencing hardships because of the current rural economic crisis.

Farmers and small businesspersons facing foreclosures, bankruptcies, bank closings, and the like often do not have money for ordinary living expenses such as food and clothing. We seek out these so-called new poor who cannot or will not bring themselves to ask for help. The reason for the cannot or the will not is because they are still in shock and cannot believe what has happened to them in a very short period of time.

The full-time status of our VISTA worker makes it possible for us to mobilize and organize others to help us in this process. Besides meeting the immediate food and clothing needs for these people, we are in the process of developing support groups as a means to prevent suicides and other forms of violence that come with this crisis.

The VISTA worker organizes and personally invites the depressed and stress-filled person to come to a support group, as well as finding leaders to facilitate these groups. We have found that advertising a support group through a church bulletin, a newspaper, or other forms of written material does not get people out to a support group.

This work could not be done on a part-time basis because the need is so great at this time. The recent passage of the 1985 farm bill and the anticipated effects of the Gramm-Rudman bill combine to heighten even more than was seen earlier when this grant was written, the very stressful situations. Loss of human service positions, extension service positions, and other helping-type positions add to the sense of loss already being experienced with the loss of home, land, business, way of life, schools, churches, and especially small businesses.

Long-range goals of the project require full-time research to find markets, artisans, craft producers, and all kinds of ideas, and the persons who are willing to try to learn other ways for alternate or

supplemental kinds of income. An innovations fair is also planned to expose people of the area to these possibilities.

It is very difficult for the rural person to understand and accept the continued acts of Government that make their lives more difficult by the cutting of programs. When one more program is cut, the common response is: "So what else is new?" The lack of give on the military budget is experienced as unjust and unreasonable. The message that the people and the land are not a worthy priority is very clear.

There is much anger and depression around these issues. Much of our effort is expended in trying to help people get beyond the anger to a place where they can pick up the pieces and begin again.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Thank you very much, Sister Goering.

I would first ask Mr. Greiff, something that we have talked about at the staff level, something that Senator Hatch and Senator Hawkins both wanted to ask, and it can really be summarized by asking you to give some observations based on your own experience about the need, as you expressed it, for opening up centers during the day. During the day and night, as you know, a number of centers are open across the country, although not a majority. To the extent that we are dealing with an inelastic Federal budget, and that there are cutbacks, how important do you stress is the idea of opening up on a 24-hour basis?

Mr. GREIFF. Well, I think it is very important, because just the provision of shelter often does not allow a person to avail himself of services that he needs.

Half of the homeless have serious medical problems, for instance, and day programs such as ours, which do not have to prepare for night shelter, to prepare for people to be sleeping, we have the energy to network and create a unified program that will meet the various needs, for medical care, for possible benefits; people have to become aware of their eligibility. They also need to diminish the isolation that they feel.

So I cannot overemphasize the importance that I feel for the development of more day centers. The Social Security Administration is considering some of its eligibility evaluations done onsite rather than at offices; again, those who are deinstitutionalized mentally ill or disturbed, whether they were part of the mental health system or not, they are often very reluctant to go through the regular process. If services are brought to people, they are much more likely to accept them, when there is a caring attitude on the part of a day center is staff. It is not quite the same attitude as the typical office of welfare or Social Security in many cities demonstrates.

Under an umbrella of a caring day center, people will be offered integrated services, and they are more likely to accept them.

So in terms of my experience, I would say it is very important.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Mr. Greiff, are most of your services provided onsite?

Mr. GREIFF. Yes.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Do you direct people to particular services, or are they onsite services?

Mr. GREIFF. Well, I will try to indicate—we, for instance, distribute clothing to 100 people a week. We are serving 1,800 meals a

week. That is 6 percent of 30,000 free meals served in Boston. We have these various State and Federal agencies—I mentioned welfare, mental health, Social Security, which have representatives at our place. So what we are trying to do is diminish this fragmentation, and that is what a day center can do. It can bring together representatives of these agencies. It also is a focus, I try to show, for private sector involvement, that is, Health Care for the Homeless, which is privately funded, and I also mentioned our relationship with Boston University.

So my feeling is that we do probably 60 percent of our service onsite, and about 40 percent of the homeless' needs are addressed off-site. We are also doing a number of housing referrals and job referrals, too, incidentally. And that is not possible to do if you do not have a day center. Most jobs are during the day, and many people are able and willing to work, so it is important that you have a day place for them where they learn about and get prepared for a job.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Mr. Greiff, once again, thank you very much.

Mrs. Martin, can you please explain a little bit from your past experience, talk about how you got involved with the program, and some of your other friends and colleagues in the program, how you first became involved?

Mrs. MARTIN. I got involved in the program through a friend of mine who was working in the program.

Dr. DOCKSAI. And are there others doing the same kind of work?

Mrs. MARTIN. Yes; at my school, at Walker Elementary, there are seven of us Foster Grandparents. There are 140 in our organization in Fort Lauderdale.

Dr. DOCKSAI. And they all receive the stipend?

Mrs. MARTIN. Yes; they all receive stipends.

Dr. DOCKSAI. And obviously, the stipend is important to them?

Mrs. MARTIN. Yes; it certainly is.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Well, once again, we are very grateful to you for being here with us today. I know all the Senators wanted to be here this morning, and a number of written questions we have will be forwarded to you, and at your convenience, we would like to ask you to answer and return them to us.

I would also ask Sister Goering, in your testimony you made reference to the type of work being done by VISTA volunteers during the farm crisis. Are there any other comments you would like to make about your own experience?

Sister GOERING. Well, I would have to concur with the others that the stipend is very important. I would not have the people working with us without the stipend. The people who are doing the VISTA volunteer work need that money for their own livelihood, as well as providing the service that we need in the area. So it is a twofold prong, you might say.

We are working with the effects of grief, which lies at the root of the economic crisis. When a person gets word that he/she has cancer and really cannot accept that, persons experience denial, anger, and depression. This is exactly what we experience in people who lose a farm or are in fear of losing it.

Right now, the farmer is in the very same place where he or she was last year at this time in not even being able to determine

whether or not they will have funds to plant a crop come March, April, and May. The Gramm-Rudman really throws a wrench into the whole decision process because the effects of that bill are not known. And so it is impossible for a farmer to sit down and try to work out a cash-flow.

The problems have been compounded because of the fact that this crisis was not foreseen, and there are few competent agricultural attorneys to help them. Many people who have dealt a couple of years with this problem can look back now and say it is clear to them the attorneys themselves did not know how to help them at the time. So people are caught in just unbelievable circumstances. They can neither get out of their debt nor can they make their operation work. It is just a matter of time before more small towns disappear because for every six or seven farms that we lose, we lose one business in town.

I was in Sheraton, IA last week, and there were 10 empty storefronts in the square. That is just a common scene. But the strife that goes with that and people's inability to provide for the immediate needs are very critical. It is those needs that this program is trying to address. We could not do it on a part-time basis because the need is so great, and there are so many people out there who are suffering.

Dr. DOCKSAI. So summarizing it for the record, you would say that the clearinghouse function is being more, not less, used?

Sister GOERING. Yes; and the success of this program very much depends upon our ability to bring in people in the area to help us with the whole process. There is more to do out there than any of the existing agencies can help with. We try to be that bridge between the time when a person is in shock about losing a farm or business and before they can get themselves to a helping agency. We need to be there, because it is very difficult for farm people to ask for food stamps and to ask for welfare. It is just a very difficult step for them to take. So we try to be that bridge in-between and try to direct them to the existing agencies that are available for them.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Sister, thank you very much.

Thank you again, all three panel members, for your patience this morning as well. We will make sure that our respective bosses know what was discussed this morning and be considered during the authorization markup.

Our final panel is composed of Ms. Nancy Doctor, president of the National Association of Senior Companion Program Directors, in Owensboro, KY; Jim Sugarman, president, National Association of Retired Senior Volunteer Program Directors, New York, NY, and Betty Manley, vice president, National Association of Foster Grandparent Program Directors, San Jose, CA.

On behalf of our majority and minority Senators, staff here welcome you this morning.

Ms. Doctor, if you would begin.

STATEMENT OF NANCY DOCTOR, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SENIOR COMPANION PROGRAM DIRECTORS, OWENSBORO, KY; JIM H. SUGARMAN, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED SENIOR VOLUNTEER PROGRAM DIRECTORS, NEW YORK, NY, AND BETTY MANLEY, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FOSTER GRANDPARENT PROGRAM DIRECTORS, SAN JOSE, CA

Ms. DOCTOR. On behalf of the Senior Companion Program projects across the country, I thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning.

I am the director of the Senior Companion project in Owensboro, KY, which serves a seven county rural area and has about 85 percent in-home placements. I am also the president of the National Association of Senior Companion Program Directors.

The Senior Companion Program is the youngest and the smallest of ACTION's Older American Volunteer Program. As you are well aware, the aging segment of our country's population is increasing at a rate far faster than any other. The demands that that increase has placed on services for the elderly has been tremendous in the past decade, The Senior Companion Program which, by the way, just completed its 10th anniversary last year, has been one of the best responses to meeting those needs.

The Senior Companion Program volunteers today are serving in such settings as community-based home health agencies, acute care hospitals, hospices, and convalescent hospitals, just to name a few. All these efforts are increasingly essential in building a continuum of care for our at-risk elderly.

Senior Companions have become an integral part of the long-term care strategy in many parts of our country today. But just as important as that, is the impact that participating in the Senior Companion Program has on the volunteers themselves. Provision of the stipend and other benefits enables these poverty-level seniors to contribute a meaningful service to other older people that they see as less fortunate than themselves.

By improving the quality of life for the Senior Companions, their own entry into what might be called the "client pool" is delayed, which in turn saves much more than the program itself costs.

We are especially excited about the data that the impact evaluation of the Homebound elderly demonstration projects and components that were funded last year will provide in documenting the positive impact of the Senior Companion Program on both volunteers and clients.

To build a little bit on the marvelous presentation that Frances Judd gave for us earlier, I would like to cite some specific examples of successes of Senior Companions through their volunteer services.

A Senior Companion in Massachusetts was assigned to an elderly woman who had been chronically ill, depressed, and was frightened to go out of her home alone and in fact had gotten to the point where she would not even go out being escorted with anyone. After a short period of time, with regular visits from the Senior Companion, the woman became able and interested in taking charge of her own affairs again, resumed contact with the community, and once

her independence was restored, the Senior Companion's hours were able to be reduced.

Companions themselves at times become recipients of the program. Again in Massachusetts, a Senior Companion's dependence on alcohol finally caused him to be hospitalized. The complications of chronic disease and his alcoholism caused him to lose mobility in his legs. Another Senior Companion who was himself a recovering alcoholic asked to be assigned to work with this man. This man is now walking again and participating in AA meetings. And through the support of his fellow volunteer, he improved enough to be able to return to the Senior Companion Program. If it had not been for SCP, this man would have lived out his life as a burden to society instead of now being again a contributing member of the community.

In Iowa, the Senior Companion Program was asked to place a volunteer with a 58-year-old woman who had suffered a stroke. A Senior Companion, again herself a stroke victim, was assigned to provide support for the woman and respite for her husband. With patience, empathy, practice, and a lot of time, the volunteer was able to help the woman learn to speak again, to learn to walk with the use of a cane, and help her to cope with the frustrations of the stroke.

Senior Companions are more and more becoming the glue that holds a total plan of care together for our clients. In Ohio, the Senior Companion Program was called in by a social worker to provide assistance for three sisters, aged 75, 85, and 86. The 86-year-old was the major care provider for the other two, both of whom had chronic health problems and mental impairments.

After several weeks of service, the social worker involved in the case reported that all three women were calmer, more cooperative, and happier than she had ever seen them. She credited the Senior Companion with being able to keep that household together.

With the costs of Medicare and Medicaid increasingly coming under fire, the impact of DRG's being felt more strongly all the time, and the freeze on the construction of new nursing home beds in some areas, more options for providing long-term care, especially in-home care, must be developed. The members of the National Association of Senior Companion Project Directors and other professionals who have become familiar with SCP in the past decade believe strongly that this program is, in fact, one whose time has truly come.

Senior Companions can often perform a wider variety of services and provide a higher level of intensity of service than many other in-home programs. The potential for SCP to become a national force in the area of long-term care can readily be seen.

I would like to add here that in our experience, we are seeing more and more that the traditional approach of providing support to individuals in their homes has to shift away from the purely medical model, where nurses and nurses' aides seem to be the focus of so much service. You do not need a nurse or a nurse's aide to go in and help somebody fix a bowl of soup, or serve someone a bowl of soup. You do not need someone professionally trained like that to help a person dress in the morning. Basic needs like that can be

met by a Senior Companion volunteer and can be done much more effectively than necessarily with younger professional people.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Ms. Doctor, may I ask you, are you familiar with the "Nursing Home Without Walls" Program? There is one in New York.

Ms. DOCTOR. Somewhat.

Dr. DOCKSAI. In other words, the institutional alternatives modes of getting volunteers—that is the type of set-up here.

Ms. DOCTOR. Yes.

The members of the NASCPD have some specific concerns relative to the operation of established projects that we would like to express today. Most of our projects have received little or no funding increases from ACTION for the past 4 years. Project administration has been affected seriously in many locations as we continue to reduce project support costs rather than to cut the amount of funding dedicated to volunteer costs. Salary increases for staff have been delayed or eliminated in some projects. Staff project positions have had to be cut. Project directors are becoming more and more concerned about attrition rates. Travel reimbursements for staff are being severely curtailed and are affecting the ability to monitor volunteer placements and support project development activities.

Concerns about covering increasing volunteer costs are just as strong. No one wants to see volunteer levels reduced, but many projects see now that soon, that will be their only recourse. Many projects have had to place caps on their volunteers' travel, a set daily maximum for which they can reimburse their volunteers, which means that these poverty-level volunteers are not getting the actual costs for their services reimbursed to them. Many projects have nearly eliminated reimbursement for meal costs for their volunteers.

We are being asked continuously to look at new service areas, and as the population increases, there certainly are more and more opportunities for SCP services to be incorporated. And yet, we are finding that we have less and less ability to meet those demands. Oftentimes, this is basically because we just do not have the money to get the volunteers there.

Also, looking at the elimination of revenue-sharing funds coupled with the threat of Gramm-Rudman, many projects are very concerned about what is going to face them in the coming year.

While budget concerns are increasingly difficult to manage, the demand for senior companion services is increasing dramatically. Many projects that I have talked with report that they have waiting lists of 25 to 50 different potential volunteers waiting to get into their programs, poverty-level volunteers, that is. And in fact, looking at the service side, in fiscal year 1985 the program provided services to 23,000-plus different recipients, but that only equaled something less than 1 percent of the 15 million frail elders who are in potential need of SCP services.

Just as early intervention is essential in meeting the needs of children with special needs, so must long-term care efforts for the elderly be initiated before irreversible deterioration begins. The Senior Companion Program should be one of the earliest services established in many patients' care plans, but unfortunately, at today's level of funding, that may never be realized.

Our members are very pleased with the cooperative attitude that has developed within ACTION relative to the flexibility of the utilization of project funds that are in excess of the required local match. We have worked very closely with the other OAUP Associations and ACTION to implement section 224 and feel very positive about the benefits it will bring in allowing our projects' increased ability to address specific local needs. It is our hope that full utilization of section 224 will be encouraged by ACTION and also that ACTION will not seek any change in the required local share for RSVP, or FGP, and SCP. To do so would only reduce the amount of funds available for local determination, and that, of course, undermines Congress' intent in approving section 224.

We are also aware that the ACTION agency is considering the fielding of nonstipended senior companions and foster grandparents. Recently, I have received calls daily from project directors that are very concerned about this possibility. Given that these volunteers would not be subject to income eligibility requirements, can they truly be called senior companions or foster grandparents? If they are not going to be required so serve the 20-hour workweek, can they truly meet the needs of our special-needs children and elders on a lesser basis of service?

We also wonder what the real difference in service here would be between these volunteers and the Retired Senior Volunteer Program. The same program needs of enabling more older persons to serve as volunteers and to serve more clients could be fulfilled through expanding RSVP projects or funding components of RSVP to be operated in conjunction with SCP and FGP projects. The success of this type of thing has already been shown in joint VISTA-RSVP efforts.

It is also important to consider that while nonstipended senior companions or foster grandparents would be less expensive to support than the traditional volunteers in these programs, they would still not be free. There would be additional administrative costs that have to be covered, as well as other direct benefits including travel, insurance, physicals, recognition.

I was pleased to hear Ms. Alvarado's comment that they would not want to have this posibility affect the volunteer service level of projects or affect the number of our projects. We would strongly oppose any reduction in VSY's or in projects in order to free implementation funds for this new concept.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Ms. Doctor, just for the record, you do formally oppose nonstipend volunteers participating in these programs in all cases?

Ms. DOCTOR. I cannot say in all cases. The idea is quite new to us right now, and we are very interested in talking with ACTION staff and exploring some alternatives that could be developed that we could support. But on the surface, from what we see right now, we cannot support the fielding of nonstipended SCA's or FGN's as it is being proposed by ACTION.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Is there any formal budget review being done maybe within ACTION or somewhere else about the costeffectiveness? For example, you are alluding to administrative costs in all cases of nonstipend volunteers, of overhead being more if you in-

clude them; are you finding that systematically, or is that anecdotal? Is there a formal study?

Ms. DOCTOR. What I was trying to say was that should nonstipended volunteers be fielded through an existing senior companion or foster grandparent project, that besides the direct cost for those volunteers, that there would of necessity be additional administrative costs just in the supplies that the project office would need to provide relative to care plans, timesheets, and all that type of thing, as well as staff travel to monitor the additional assignments, and new additional travel or new travel for volunteer stations for these assignments, and the cost of supervision.

Dr. DOCKSAI. These questions are raised because Congress gets letters all the time from people, particularly over the last few years, saying that they need particular services, and indeed they do. There are waiting lists of people who want to volunteer and who want to work, and they would be categorized probably as nonstipend. Certainly, the administrative cost question is a serious one, it is one to be raised, but to the extent that that does not apply to groups of people, it is obviously commonsense that these people would be employed, that they would be used in the program. But that is something to consider.

Ms. DOCTOR. There is a lot to be considered in developing whatever might be considered as a demonstration, or whatever, as a variation on the existing programs.

I would like to comment on a couple of things that were part of the ACTION Agency's testimony. I do feel a little at a disadvantage having not had that until we arrived here this morning and listened to the actual testimony, but I will blunder ahead.

The matter of the advisory council for the agency. In past testimony in 1983, we recommended that the provision for the agency advisory council be repealed. This was in fact accomplished, and the advisory council was dissolved at the end of 1985, but we see has again been reestablished as of January 22 of this year.

Besides questioning the appropriateness of how this was done, we also would like to pose a few points that the committee might want to ascertain–one being what was the annual cost for this advisory council, and at this time is it necessarily the best use of rather strained dollars to reestablish that? Who is now serving on this advisory council? How many of the members that were serving on the council that was dissolved are in fact members now, and if there are new members, how were they selected, and what representation were they providing?

We would like to have some specific instances of the accomplishments of the advisory council in the past, and how they compare to the cost that was involved in supporting the advisory council in the past. We have never seen an annual report on what it has accomplished, and we wonder if such a report exists.

Also, we wonder, on the new council if there are representatives of the program, or representatives of the clients served. That has been a traditional part of the advisory councils that all of our projects themselves have, and there are particular benefits to including representation of that type. We wonder if it has not been desired by the agency, if there is some reason for that.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Fair enough. We hope to get some answers.

Ms. DOCTOR. We are also aware that there may be some consideration of change in evaluation of the programs. We have got no particular objection to any change. We do wonder why a change might be sought now when this was just dealt in in the last round of hearings, but we feel again that the quality of whatever evaluation of the programs is done is much more important than necessarily the frequency.

In the administration's testimony, we noted with real concern that the requested authorized level for SCP be set at $18.086 million. This would just equal our current funding level which is far below the $28.6 million for which we are currently authorized. We request that the authorized level be maintained at the $28.6 million level. Knowing how this committee, particularly Senator Hatch, has come to value and look toward expanding the Senior Companion Program, we certain urge that this be done.

We appreciate the opportunity to share our present concerns and our future visions for the Senior Companion Program today. As our authorization does expire on September 20 of this year, we hope that you will recommend a 3-year extension of the program. As you can tell from the testimony, we are not advocating any major changes for the Senior Companion Program.

As always, we appreciate your consideration of these concerns, and certainly, we appreciate your support and your interest in the programs for the elderly that we strive to serve.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Doctor with an enclosure follows:]

TESTIMONY OF NANCY DOCTOR, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SENIOR COMPANION PROJECT DIRECTORS, SENIOR COMPANION PROGRAM DIRECTOR, AUDUBON AREA COMMUNITY SERVICES, INC., OWENSBORO, KY

Senator Hawkins and members of the Committee, on behalf of the Senior Companion Program projects across the country, I thank you for this opportunity to testify about the Senior Companion Program and the ACTION agency.

The National Association of Senior Companion Project Directors (NASCPD) was established in 1978. Its membership currently includes project directors, from nearly every state representing 65% of the projects in the country. The purpose of the NASCPD is to provide an opportunity for expression of opinion on matters effecting Senior Companions across the country and to provide a means of regular communication among the project directors. The Association enjoys a very good working relationship with the ACTION agency and welcomes opportunities to encourage efforts to expand the support and utilization of senior volunteers in this country.

The Senior Companion Program is the youngest and smallest of ACTION's Older American Volunteer Programs. The Senior Companion Program has expanded since the original eighteen (18) projects were funded in 1974, but even at the level of ninety-six (96) projects today is far from meeting the needs of our rapidly increasing aging population. As you are aware, the aging segment of our country's population is increasing at a rate faster than any other. The demands that increase has placed on services for the elderly in the past decade have been tremendous. The development of the Senior Companion Program is one of the best responses to meeting those needs. The program has generated an increasing variety of volunteer opportunities for the low-income older person. Senior Companions are serving today in such

settings as community based home health agencies, acute-care hospitals, hospices, rehabilitation associations and centers, public health departments and clinics, mental health agencies and associations, nursing homes and convalescent hospitals. All these efforts are increasingly essential in building a continuum of care for our "at-risk" elderly. And yet the fact that Senior Companions in many areas of the country have become an integral part of the long-term care service strategy is only one part of the SCP story. Just as important is the impact participating as a Senior Companion has on the volunteers themselves. Provision of the stipend and other benefits enables these poverty-level seniors to contribute a meaningful service to other older persons they see as less fortunate than themselves. By improving the quality of life for the Senior Companions, their own entry into the "client pool" is delayed - saving much more, monetarily and otherwise, than it costs to support the program. We look forward to the data that the impact evaluation of the new Home-Bound Elderly projects and components funded during FY '85 will provide in further documenting the positive impact of the Senior Companion Program on both volunteers and clients.

To better understand the Senior Companion Program, a description of a "typical" volunteer might be helpful. I will draw from my own project's statistics to do so. She is seventy-years old. She lives alone, and is struggling with the idea of giving up her home and moving into an apartment. She already has her name "on the list" in case she makes up her mind to do so. She wears eyeglasses - and hasn't had the prescription checked for three years because there's always something more important to

do with the money. She has a car, but doesn't like to drive it after dark or in bad weather, and avoids the "busy" routes when getting around town. She has one child who lives within 30 miles - the others have moved away. Her income consists of Social Security and a little interest she draws from a bank account - it totals $4,575 annually. Other than when she goes to the Health Department for her annual SCP physical examination she sees a doctor only in case of emergencies. Before joining the program she experienced a lot of anxiety, a lack of energy, and periods of depression. Now she says she sleeps better, has a better appetite, and has more friends. She says she joined the program to help others - because she always enjoyed "working with old folks."

Some first hand examples of actual Senior Companion's efforts with their selected recipients can provide an overview of the effectiveness of the Senior Companion Program.

A Senior Companion in Massachusetts was assigned to an elderly woman who had been chronically ill, depressed and was frightened to go out of her home alone. The volunteer made regular visits and encouraged the woman to participate in simple activities like working puzzles and reading together. As their relationship strengthened the recipient's self-confidence gradually increased. The SCP Project Director encountered the volunteer and the recipient at a nutrition site one day and learned it was the first time in months that the woman had left her home. Before long the woman began taking charge of her own affairs again, and resumed contact with the community. With her independence restored, the Senior Companion's hours

have been reduced.

Sometimes Senior Companions themselves become recipients of the program. Again in Massachusetts, a Senior Companion's dependence on alchohol finally caused him to be hospitalized. His physical deterioration caused him severe mobility problems, and he lost the use of his legs. Another Senior Companion, himself a recovering alchoholic, asked to be assigned to help this man. He is now walking again, and participating in AA meetings. Because of his fellow volunteer's support, he improved enough to return to the Senior Companion Program.

A woman in Ohio was not as fortunate in overcoming her health problems. Complications from diabetes and high blood pressure necessitated the amputation of one leg. The ordeal caused her to suffer severe depression, but a Senior Companion who had been assigned to her helped her handle the emotional trauma and provided support throughout her recuperation. She says she doesn't know how she could have ever handled the pain - both physical and emotional - without the help of the Senior Companion. She has now progressed to the point of being fitted for an artificial leg. She's determined to regain her mobility and again be independent.

The sharing of common life experiences is a frequent benefit SCP offers over other types of long-term care services. In Iowa the Senior Companion Program was asked to place a volunteer with a 58 year old woman who had suffered a stroke. The mobility in her right arm and leg had been

affected, and her speech and hearing were damaged. A Senior Companion, herself a stroke victim, was assigned to provide support for the woman and respite for her husband. With patience, empathy, practice and time the volunteer was able to help the woman learn to speak again, learn to walk with the use of a cane, and helped her cope with the frustrations the effects of the stroke caused. The volunteer was also helpful to the husband as he learned to adjust to his wife's disabilities and enabled him to better support her emotionally.

Monitoring medications and their effect on recipients is an important part of many Senior Companions' assignments. A volunteer in Vermont was assigned to a woman who had over the past three years undergone surgeries for ulcers, gall bladder and a broken hip. The woman was very nervous, and unable to do things like shop, pay bills or buy groceries for herself. The Senior Companion found the lady had been taking a lot of medicine for a long period of time. She would call the doctor and get prescriptions written without going in to see him. When the Companion persuaded her to see the doctor, several of her prescriptions were discontinued, and others cut back. Almost immediately her attitude improved and she became more alert. She became able to pay her own bills, took interest in buying things for her apartment, and learned how to ride the bus to the mall - alone. Now, she works at the area meal site cleaning tables as a volunteer.

Senior Companions are often brought in to serve as the "glue" in holding a total plan of care together. In Ohio the Senior Companion Program was

called in by a social worker to provide assistance for three sisters aged 75, 85 and 86. The 86 year old sister was the major care provider for the other two. The younger sisters have multiple chronic health problems, and mental impairments. The elder sister displayed some resistance to allowing someone else to care for her sisters, but realized that she was becoming worn out herself and needed some relief from her burden. A service plan was developed for the companion to provide 10 hours of service per week addressing home management, meal preparation, personal care and respite care. After several weeks of service had gone by the social worker's reports indicated that all three women were calmer and more cooperative than she had ever seen them. The household situation was also much improved: the Senior Companion Program was credited with keeping the family together.

With the costs of Medicare and Medicaid increasingly coming under fire, the impact of DRG's being felt more strongly all the time, and the freeze on the construction of new nursing home beds in some areas, more options in providing long-term care - especially in-home care - must be developed. The members of the NASCPD, and many other professionals who have become familiar with the Senior Companion Program in the past decade, believe strongly that this is a program "whose time has truly come." The perspective of senior helping senior provides benefits that are incomparable. Further advantages of the Senior Companion Program are the variety of activities Senior Companions can perform and the greater intensity of service SCP provides compared to most in-home services. The potential for the Senior Companion Program to be a major national force in

the area of long-term care can be readily seen - only the necessary funding is lacking to make it a reality.

It is with an eye towards the future that we are here today. I am pleased to provide information on the new SCP projects and components that were granted under the Home-Bound Elderly Demonstration funds in FY '85. In all, nineteen (19) new projects and seventeen (17) new components to existing projects were funded. On an annualized basis these projects will support an additional 1,036 Senior Companions. (See charts attached for project locations and volunteer and funding levels). Unfortunately, since these grants were announced just prior to the end of FY '85 there is no information on the impact of the demonstration that I can present to you at this time.

The members of the NASCPD have some specific concerns relative to the operation of established projects we would like to express. Most of our projects have received little or no funding increases from ACTION (other than to raise the volunteer stipend) for the past four to seven years. While sponsors and project directors have been very successful in generating alternative funding sources, these have not been adequate to help severe operating difficulties from developing. Project administration is being affected as we continue to reduce project support costs rather than cut the amount of funding dedicated to volunteer costs. Salary increases for staff have had to be eliminated or delayed, and in some projects staff positions have been cut. Project directors report that staff attrition rates are an increasing concern. Travel reimbursement

funds for staff to monitor volunteer placements and to support project development activities are being curtailed in some locations. Basic operational needs such as telephone costs, copying, forms and postage costs are a few of the other areas project directors report are causing increasing budget problems. Concerns about covering increasing volunteer costs are just as strong. No one wants volunteer levels reduced, but many projects see that as the only remaining resort if increases are not received. Many projects have had to place reimbursement "caps" on their volunteers' travel. This means that the poverty-level volunteer is not receiving compensation for actual costs incurred in their volunteer services. Some projects have also nearly eliminated their reimbursement to Senior Companions for the out-of-pocket meal costs. New service opportunities - even those in the emphasis areas we are asked to address - must go wanting because there is no means of transporting the volunteers to their assignments. The elimination of revenue-sharing funds presents an additional spector for consideration. Some projects are feeling the cuts in their present year budgets. Many have been notified to plan on submitting requests for reduced levels next year. The NASCPD will be joining the Foster Grandparents and Retired Senior Volunteer Project Directors' Associations in conducting a study of the impact the lack of funding increases and the reduction of revenue sharing funds is having on our projects. We will be happy to share the results with the committee and work with you in solving the problems.

While budget concerns are becoming increasingly difficult to manage, the demand for Senior Companion services is increasing dramatically. Most

projects report that they have waiting lists of twenty-five (25) to fifty (50) potential volunteers on file. In FY '85 the 6,765 Senior Companions who served provided support to 23,314 recipients. This represents less than 1% of the 15 million "frail-elders" who potentially are in need of service. Just as early intervention is essential in meeting the needs of children with special needs, so must long-term care efforts for the elderly be initiated before irreversable deterioration begins. The Senior Companion Program should be one of the earliest services established in many patients' care plans - but at today's levels of funding that will never be realized.

In looking at the increased needs of the aging population as a whole, we also see increased needs in some of our volunteers. As the projects mature, the average age of the SCP volunteers increases. As this happens, the range of activities some Companions can perform may be diminished. The quandry project directors face is how to weigh the needs of the client population against those of the volunteers. It would appear at first thought that as a volunteer program the priority should be upon our enrollees. Looking at the program initiatives and special emphasis areas however, it can be seen that we must always be conscious of the total community needs. The project directors expect this area of conflict to continue to grow and its ramifications to be increasingly difficult to reconcile.

During FY '85, approximately 13% of the resources in the Senior Companion Program were non-ACTION funds. The NASCPD members are very pleased with

the cooperative attitude that has developed within ACTION relative to flexibility in the utilization of the funds that are in excess of the required local match. The SCP, FGP, and RSVP Director's Associations have worked very closely with ACTION on the implementation of Section 224, and feel very positive about the benefits that it will bring in allowing increased ability to address specific project needs at the local level. It is our hope that full utilization of Section 224 will be encouraged by ACTION, and also that the Agency will not seek any change in ths required local share of RSVP, FGP, and SCP budgets. To do so would reduce the amount of funds available for local determination, undermining Congress' intent in approving Section 224.

In the last round of reauthorization hearings the NASCPD testified in favor of a new provision to prevent states from requiring that our projects pay into Workmen's Compensation for our volunteers. Implementation of this provision has allowed tne fielding of additional Senior Companions by redirecting those funds into volunteer stipends. The Minnesota project, for example, at that time was required to pay into Workmen's Compensation at an extremely high rate. Elimination of that requirement allowed them to support three more Senior Companions. There are some concerns amongst the project directors about providing a means to continue the stipend benefit for volunteers who are injured "on-the-job" for at least a minimal amount of time. We are interested in continuing to work with ACTION to look at possible ways of accomplishing this goal, and would welcome the committee's involvement in resolving this concern.

Last fall in our testimony before the House Education-Labor Subcommittee on Human Resources we asked that consideration be given to establishing the position of OAVP Director as a Presidential Appointee. The intent in doing so was to provide greater recognition of the importance of this position and strengthen its standing. We encourage the committee to be cognizant of this need and consider implementing this change.

The SCP, FGP, and RSVP Director's Associations are aware that ACTION is asking for legislation to allow them to filed non-stipended Senior Companions and Foster Grandparents. (The motivation behind the effort appears to be very logical. Both programs have extensive waiting lists of volunteers and clients alike. Some means of bringing these two groups together would be a very appropriate goal. We have several concerns that would need to be addressed in bringing such an effort to reality. Would non-stipended volunteers be required to meet the income eligibility guidelines? If not, can they truly be called SCP's or FGP's? If so, would we not be exploiting the poverty-level volunteer by asking them to serve in the same capacity as volunteers without the same benefits? Would the non-stipended volunteers be required to serve a twenty-hour week? If not, can they truly meet the needs of our special needs children and elders on a lesser basis of service? What would be the real difference between this effort and the Retired Senior Volunteer Program? RSVP offers opportunities for non-stipended volunteerism. The same program needs of enabling more older persons to serve as volunteers, and to serve more clients, could be fulfilled through expanding RSVP projects or funding components of RSVP volunteers to work with FGP and SCP projects. The success of this has

already been shown in joint VISTA-RSVP efforts. It is also important to consider that while a non-stipended Senior Companions or Foster Grandparents would be less expensive to support than the traditional volunteers in these programs, they would still not be "free." Projects would incur additional administrative costs that must be covered, as well as the direct benefits costs of travel, insurance, physicals, recognition, etc. We would be pleased to work with ACTION in exploring the feasibility of implementing this concept or developing other alternatives that would allow the programs to expand volunteer levels, but must reiterate that this cannot be done without additional funding. We strongly oppose the implementation of this concept if doing so will result in the elimination of existing projects or the reduction of VSY's to free implementation funds.

We appreciate the opportunity to share our present concerns and future visions for the Senior Companion Program. As our authorization will expire on September 20, 1986, we hope you will recommend that Congress provide a three-year extension of our programs. As you can tell from this testimony, we are not advocating any major changes for the Senior Companion Program. Your consideration of the concerns and recommendations presented herein will be appreciated. As always, we thank you for your interest in our programs and your support for the elderly we strive to serve.

Nancy L. Doctor, President
National Association of Senior
Companion Project Directors

SCP/HE NEW PROJECTS-FY 1985 10/7/85

REGION	CITY, ST.	ANN LEVEL VSY'S	ANN LEVEL $	FY85 LEVEL VSY'S	FY85 LEVEL $
I	NORTHAMPTON, MA	45	$148,500	40	$132,000
	WATERBURY, CT	40	132,000	34	115,235
II	SYRACUSE, NY	60	198,000	45	175,626
	PONCE, PR	30	99,000	24	87,813
III	BALTIMORE, MD	60	198,000	53	175,600
IV	MEMPHIS, TN	60	198,000	53	175,700
	ASHEVILLE, NC	59	185,000	50	164,200
	TAMPA, FL	30	99,000	25	87,800
V	DETROIT, MI	60	199,315	54	176,792
	ALPENA, MI	40	132,000	32	117,084
VI	EL PASO, TX	65	196,900	58	174,650
	WICHITA, KS	30	99,000	27	87,813
	RUSSELVILLE, AR	30	100,000	27	88,700
	HOUSTON, TX	40	132,000	35	117,084
VIII	SALT LAKE CITY, UT	60	198,000	46	175,627
	MISSOULA, MT	21	66,000	18	58,542
IX	FLAGSTAFF, AZ	42	132,000	35	117,084
	SAN JOSE, CA	30	99,000	27	87,813
X	SEATTLE, WA	45	148,500	40	131,720
	19 PROJECTS	847	$2,760,215	723	$2,446,883

SCP/HE COMPONENTS-FY 1985

REGION	CITY, ST.	VSY'S	ANN LEVEL $
II	NIAGARA FALLS, NY	12	$33,000
IV	GOLDSBORO, NC	12	37,961
	TALLAHASSEE, FL	12	36,312
	MIAMI, FL	12	39,780
V	CHICAGO, IL	10	33,000
	ESCANABA, MI	12	38,544
	MINNEAPOLIS, MN	15	44,595
	INDIANAPOLIS, IN	12	39,600
VI	OPELOUSAS, LA	10	28,630
	ROLLA, MO	10	29,650
	HAYS, KS	10	30,771
VIII	OGDEN, UT	10	33,000
	SIOUX FALLS, SD	10	33,000
	HELENA, MT	10	33,000
	DENVER, CO	12	39,600
IX	FRESNO, CA	10	31,231
X	ANCHORAGE, AK	10	30,990
	17 COMPONENTS	189	$592,664

National Association of Senior Companion Project Directors

HISTORY

The National Association of Senior Companion Project Directors (NASCPD) was initiated in 1978. It developed from a need felt by many SCP Project Directors to have an organization that could address their collective needs and concerns relative to the Senior Companion Program and channel their efforts to resolve their problems. At the 1978 National SCP Directors Training Conference a meeting was held to form the Association. Officers were elected and charged with developing By-Laws and operating practices. These directives were achieved early in 1979, and the NASCPD has actively represented the needs of SCP Project Directors nation-wide since that time.

PURPOSE

The National Association of Senior Companion Project Directors provides an opportunity for expression and education for and by Directors of SCP Projects. It provides a vehicle for communication between the SCP Project Directors, organizations and agencies serving the Senior Companion Program, as well as the ACTION regional and national offices. The NASCPD also encourages coordinated mutually supportive services within the aging network. A major goal of the organization is to avoid duplication of services and maximize both the quality and the level of services provided for the elderly.

STRUCTURE

Active membership is open to all Directors and employees of SCP Projects. All active members have voting privileges. Associate memberships are open to other interested persons or groups (such as sponsor representatives and advisory council members). Associate members do not have NASCPD voting privileges.

The NASCPD is operated through a Board of Directors. The Board of Directors is composed of the national officers (President, Vice-President, and Secretary/Treasurer) and a Regional Representative elected by the paid members of each of the ACTION outlined regions.

OPERATION

The NASCPD By-Laws call for annual meetings of the Board of Directors. Financial constraints have made that impossible, so in practice Association business is conducted by mail and through telephone contacts. General meetings are held whenever an ACTION sponsored national training conference is held. Regional membership meetings are scheduled to coincide with regional OAVP training conferences.

SUCCESS-AREAS OF INVOLVEMENT

Since its inception the NASCPD has had significant impact on the operation and development of the Senior Companion Programs nation-wide.

1. The NASCPD was instrumental in preserving the current level of funding for SCP when cuts were proposed.
2. The NASCPD was successful in bringing about changes in the ACTION re-authorization legislation that will enhance the direction of the Senior Companion Program and the operation of the ACTION agency.
3. The NASCPD played a major role in securing stipend increases for volunteers, and significant general program increases.

SCP

58-263 O - 86 - 3

National Association of Senior Companion Project Directors

President:
Vice President:
Secretary/Treasurer:

February 28, 1986

Dr. Ronald F. Docksai, Staff Director
United States Senate
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Dr. Docksai:

Enclosed is the transcript of my remarks before the Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism on February 6, 1986.

All corrections are basically grammatical with the exception of my response to your question regarding the involvement of non-stipended volunteers in "these" programs. Let me first say that when I consider these programs I include RSVP and FGP as well as SCP. In my response I intended to convey our position on ACTION's current plan to bring non-stipended volunteers into SCP and FGP. We unequivically oppose that proposal as it is now being presented. At the same time, I also wanted to show that we are open to exploring alternatives to this idea that we could accept. To explain more fully the reasons behind this position, and to show that we are open to other approaches, I am enclosing a letter sent to Senator Hawkins following the Hearing.

Let me say again, I appreciated the opportunity to appear before the committee to represent the Senior Companion Program. It was a pleasure to meet you, and I look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

Nancy L. Doctor, President
National Association of Senior
Companion Project Directors

Enclosures (2)

SCP

National Association of Senior Companion Project Directors

President:
Nancy L. Doctor
P.O. Box 630
Owensboro, KY 42302

Vice President:
Beryl Thompson
P.O. Box 1510
Opelousas, LA 70570

Secretary/Treasurer:
Anne Davenport
103 S. Main St.
Waterbury, Vermont 05676

February 20, 1986

The Honorable Paula Hawkins
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Senator Hawkins:

I am writing not only as President of the National Association of Senior Companion Project Directors (NASCPD), but also as the Senior Companion/Foster Grandparent Program Director in Owensboro, Kentucky. I am very concerned about the ACTION agency's thrust to field non-stipended Senior Companions and Foster Grandparents. Our legislation specifies that our program is "to create volunteer opportunities for low-income elderly" (PL93-113). Bringing volunteers of higher income levels into our programs will result in real changes that will detract from the benefits SCP and FGP provide. The real beauty of these two programs has always been the impact that accrues to both the volunteer and the elder or child they serve. Programming without that mutual benefit changes the complexion of the programs altogether. I acknowledge that there are waiting lists of potential volunteers who cannot be brought into our programs because of funding limitations. There are also many, many older adults and young children who await the services of a SCP or FGP volunteer. I counter, however that there are other alternatives besides changing the essence of SCP and FGP that could be developed in order to achieve ACTION's goal of increasing volunteer levels. A wide variety of volunteer opportunities exist in our communities for persons with higher income levels who want to volunteer. The Title III Older Americans Act Programs, Voluntary Action Center, United Ways, Big Brother/Big Sister Programs, and many other such organizations all present rewarding service opportunities. These options are not available to the persons SCP and FGP enroll due to their income limitations. Within our own family of ACTION programs, RSVP can serve an older person's need for involvement in their community. Encouraging SCP/FGP type activities in existing RSVP projects or funding RSVP components to existing projects should be explored.

In my opinion this program variation has been developed within ACTION too quickly for inclusion in this round of legislation. The potential impact of this change should be explored before authorization is granted. Alternatives that would achieve the end of allowing more volunteers to be enrolled in our projects and a higher level of service delivery should also be developed. A limited demonstration plan should be established with a required evaluation/impact piece also needs to be a part of such a plan. In this day and time it is important that flexibility be emphasized in all our programs, but reactive change without responsible judgement must not be allowed to effect programs that have proven their service and cost effectiveness.

SCP

Your consideration of these comments and concerns is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Nancy L. Doctor, President
National Association of Senior
Companion Project Directors

Dr. DOCKSAI. Thank you, Ms. Doctor. You are an able representative of Kentucky, as well as the Senior Companion Program.

Maybe what we can also do for both Jim Sugarman and Betty Manley is for you to summarize your testimony, and we will include the whole text of it in the formal record. We will also follow up by written questions and send those to you and at your convenience, if you could have those sent back to us with the answers.

I see Senator Grassley is just coming in, so we will wait a moment for him.

[Whereupon, Senator Grassley assumed the Chair.]

Senator GRASSLEY. Please proceed, and thank you for being patient while we change teams here under the necessary absence of Senator Hawkins.

Please proceed, Mr. Sugarman.

Mr. SUGARMAN. Thank you very much. We are delighted to have you join us Senator Grassley.

Today, I will be presenting testimony on the RSVP Program. My name is James Sugarman, and I am president of the National Association of Retired Senior Volunteer Program Directors, and I am director of the Retired Senior Volunteer Program of New York City, an effort of 10,000 senior volunteers in the five boroughs of New York City.

I am honored to be able to speak about RSVP and its activities, as it is a program that I take great joy in being associated with. This week in particular, a few things happened which make my testimony even much more important.

A senior volunteer approached me who happens to be a close friend as well, as he was aware that I was going to be presenting testimony. He asked me to say a few things. He said that, "The youth are our resources of the future, and the elders need to be acknowledged as our resources of today. As the aged increase in numbers," he said, "the value of senior voluntarism increases for our society, for the recipients of service, and last but not least, for the older person."

His statement reinforced the importance of my being here today.

As director of RSVP in New York City, I take particular pride in acknowledging that the prototype for RSVP was developed on Staten Island in 1966. In 1971, the premise of RSVP was to provide meaningful opportunities for older people. Today, the program is also concerned with addressing community needs through senior volunteer personpower.

In 1971, there were 11 projects. Today there are over 700 projects with over 350,000 volunteers across the Nation. I believe I can speak for other RSVP directors and other older people in this country—when I say that we are only touching the tip of a great iceberg.

The purpose of our National Association is to provide visibility and advocacy for RSVP; to provide a communications network for RSVP directors and projects, and a vehicle for expression of opinion on behalf of RSVP and older Americans to ACTION, and the Administration on Aging, Congress, and other appropriate governmental and national units.

RSVP has gone through many changes since its beginnings. The association has monitored these changes and as best as possible has worked closely with ACTION to assist in the implementation of new guidelines and program priority areas.

This has been particularly true during the last year, when we were dealing with the issues around section 224 and the initiation by the association of a literacy project with B. Dalton Booksellers, Laubach Literacy, and ACTION.

Section 224 provides project directors with greater flexibility in the allocation of funds to address their particular community needs and gives ACTION a better picture of volunteer costs. The literacy initiative has provided projects with average grants of $2,400 to carry out adult literacy programs using senior volunteers. Over 190 of our projects applied for those funds during 6 weeks this past summer. That is a statement about the critical need for those additional dollars. We are pleased that this project has already been so successful and continues to build a network of literacy programs.

RSVP is a program for all communities in service to all populations. Volunteers are providing millions of dollars of enhancement, enrichment, and support services in hospitals, nursing homes, public schools, shelters, senior centers—every possible nonprofit setting, every possible educational and cultural setting. There are hundreds and hundreds of examples throughout this country of RSVP volunteers providing service. They are listed in my testimony, and I hope you will have a chance to read them.

Those that are listed, however, are but a handful of the opportunities available to senior volunteers. The positive impact on the community, for the client, the patient, the student, and also for the senior volunteer is incalculable. The benefits for all are immeasurable. The cost to the taxpayer is negligible.

The National Association of RSVP Directors is pleased that RSVP has continued to receive increased support by Members of Congress over the past 15 years. We are also grateful to the thousands of other supporters which include foundations, corporations, business, local governments, and over 30 States which presently provide funds and other resources. We also acknowledge that in this era of limited Federal dollars, we have a responsibility to further develop those resources.

It is important to note that even with these resources, projects are being affected drastically by cuts in revenue sharing. Our association is presently involved in a study to review the impact of revenue sharing. Gramm-Rudman-Hollings as well will most likely mean additional cuts. We hope that all will be done so that RSVP and other ACTION Programs will not be affected dramatically.

Many RSVP programs have not received an increase in Federal funding over the last 7 years, which means a decrease. Many of us have not received an additional dollar, though the cost of living, rent, and operational expenses have gone up—items which are often very difficult to fund raise for.

As decisions are made regarding the reauthorization, we hope that the bill proposed will have as few changes to existing law as possible so that it can move through the process quickly.

Each year, the number of people reaching retirement age increases. With these additional dollars, we hope that there will be additional dollars. Like ACTION, we want to be able to increase senior volunteer personpower. In addition, funds will be needed to help us develop recruitment and placement of more skilled retirees.

In line with another issue that we are concerned with on a national level is the issue of image. It is very difficult to go out and raise funds for a program which is a national program that people have not heard of. RSVP is a national program without a national image. Very few people have heard about RSVP on a national basis. We believe that it is important that ACTION take an active stand in promoting RSVP nationally.

We understand that ACTION is proposing nonstipended foster grandparent and senior companion volunteers. We have many concerns about this. It is the view of our association that such opportunities would dramatically change those two programs and affect RSVP as well. It would not be cost free for SCP and FGP projects, as there would still be costs for administration and out-of-pocket expenses. It would duplicate what RSVP is presently doing and change the image of SCP and FGP which have been programs for low-income elderly—something which I think has been very, very important.

It would further create an inequity between stipended and nonstipended volunteers doing the same thing. If any of you have ever worked at a place where one person is being paid and another person is not being paid and doing the same identical work, it readily causes problems. When ACTION reviews the possibility of developing this project, they will work closely with the three associations in designing and implementing it.

We are strongly opposed to ACTION's request to increase the non-Federal share to 50 percent. There is a great deal of testimony about the need to reduce the cap to 30 percent in the hearing records of both the House and Senate committee hearings from 1983. The information presented then holds even more true today. With budget cuts to come, private-sector resources will be stretched more than ever, and it will become increasingly harder to raise local funds. One local county in New York State has had a very difficult time even reaching their 30 percent. It is a poor county, Schuyler County, and every year, they have more and more difficulty meeting the match.

Permit me in closing to share a story with you, as well as point out a few other things about the testimony that was presented this morning by ACTION.

It so happens that yesterday I had a chance to visit an RSVP site in East Harlem, the barrio. It was in a senior citizen housing project. Several months ago, RSVP staff developed a tenant patrol group of eight retired men in this particular housing project. Today, they and their fellow residents now feel that they have the safest apartment building in all of East Harlem. Because resources were available to develop this particular tenant patrol, because we

were able to give them the technical assistance, to recruit the volunteers, to monitor the placement, there is now less crime in their apartment building. It was a great feeling knowing that 100 elderly people feel safer in their own homes because of RSVP's efforts.

Hopefully, as the senior population swells to over 13 percent of this country within the next 10 to 14 years, RSVP will be there, better able to respond to the needs of the community and even more important, to be able to promote the well-being of older Americans and the vision that older people are contributors to our society.

RSVP is working to change the image of older Americans as contributors. Many times, when I have a chance to visit stations, I am overwhelmed by what I see the senior volunteers doing. I hope that all of you get a chance to visit RSVP programs and take a look, a close look, at what they are doing.

In closing, I would like to comment on some of the issues presented by the administration. In the testimony presented this morning by Donna Alvarado, she talked about several issues. The first one that I wish to bring up again is the issue of the 50-percent match. We believe that this is totally unacceptable. Local resources have been stretched to the maximum, and though we are going to continue to develop them because increases in transportation and other operational expenses will come along. In New York City, our public transportation went up by 5 cents, and we are now not offering that additional nickel to every volunteer. This is something we do not have.

In addition, I want to bring up the other issue that was raised about the Director of ACTION's authority to develop private-sector funds. We feel the idea is excellent, but we feel it has to be looked at very, very closely. It is a Catch-22 situation. If the Director of ACTION is able to raise funds on a national level, we will have to look at how it impacts upon local projects raising funds from the same resources. It is easy to say that she will go out and talk with Exxon or CBS but many of us are doing the same. What kind of impact will that have for all of us. We hope that this will be a joint effort on which we will work together.

Many thanks for allowing us to present our testimony today. I would hope that next time you will also include an RSVP volunteer to speak. They are also doing wonderful things improving the quality of help for hundreds of thousands of people throughout our country.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Sugarman follows:]

Testimony of James H. Sugarman, President, National Association of RSVP Directors

Thank you for inviting us to present testimony to this Oversight Hearing. My name is James Sugarman. I am President of the National Association of Retired Senior Volunteer Program Directors and the Director of the Retired Senior Volunteer Program in New York City. I am always honored to be able to speak about RSVP, its activities and its unlimited potential as a support for older Americans and as a resource for service.

As the Director of RSVP in New York City, I take particular pride in acknowledging that the prototype for RSVP was developed on Staten Island in 1965. This model, known as Project SERVE, Serve and Enrich Retirement by Volunteer Experience, was created at a time when increasing numbers of women, a primary volunteer population, were moving into the labor force, few successful models of organized senior volunteerism had been developed, and older people were starting to retire earlier and, in turn, were being faced with the age-old question of how to best use retirement years. Based on RSVP's success and growth, I am sure you will agree that the original model addressed those issues and many others!

In 1971, when the program was launched under ACTION, the federal volunteer agency, the premise was to provide meaningful opportunities for older people. Today the program is also concerned with addressing community needs through senior volunteer personpower. In 1971 there were eleven projects. Today there are over 700 projects with over 350,000 volunteers across the nation. And we believe that we are dealing only with the tip of a great iceberg of potential talent.

The National Association of RSVP Directors, which represents over 65% of RSVP Directors throughout the country, has been in existence since 1976. Our purpose has been to provide, through a national focus:

-- Visibility and advocacy for RSVP

-- A communications network for RSVP Directors and projects

-- A vehicle for expression of opinion on behalf of RSVP and older Americans to ACTION, the Administration on Aging, Congress, and other appropriate governmental and national units.

We have worked, and continue to work with other interest groups in promoting the well-being of the elderly. As a result of our intervention, we have influenced legislation which has enabled our programs to grow and improve the quality of life for hundreds of thousands of older Americans.

RSVP has undergone many changes since its beginning, though the basic premise to provide meaningful opportunities for older people has remained the same. The Association has monitored these changes and, as best as possible, has worked closely with ACTION to assist in the implementation of new guidelines and program priority areas. This has been particularly

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

true during the last year with Section 224 and the initiation by the Association of a literacy project with B. Dalton Booksellers, Laubach Literacy and ACTION.

Section 224 provides Project Directors greater flexibility in the allocation of funds to address their particular community needs and gives ACTION a better picture of volunteer costs. It has been carefully monitored by the Association so that Project Directors will be able to implement it with minimal problems. The literacy initiative has provided projects with average grants of $2,400.00 to carry out adult literacy projects involving senior volunteers. Over 190 projects applied for these funds. Unfortunately, there was only $120,000.00 available, so that only a handful of projects actually received funds. We hope that the future will bring many more opportunities for our Association, ACTION, and the private sector to develop such partnerships. We are pleased that this one has already been so successful.

RSVP is a program for all communities in service to all populations in need. Since its inception on Staten Island, where 23 volunteers fed, clothed and sewed for hundreds of disabled children, RSVP has invariably sought to address the needs of each particular community of which it has become a part. Our volunteers provide millions of dollars of enhancement, enrichment and support services in hospitals, nursing homes, public schools, shelters, senior centers, tax counselling facilities, food pantries, and other non-profit, cultural, social service, educational and public service settings. Let me give you a few specific examples:

* In Willoughby-Eastlake, Ohio, 70 Volunteers serve in school district as teachers' aides, English-as-a-second-language tutors, Adult Basic Education instructors

* In Minneapolis, Minnesota, eight volunteers serve the deinstitutionalized mentally retarded with companionship and living skills

* In Rhinelander, Wisconsin, five volunteers serve chilren in a Domestic Violence Shelter

* In Gloucester, Massachusetts, 25 volunteers provide tax counselling to over 1200 low-income elderly

* In Bellingham, Washington, 46 volunteers provide a Surveillance to Detour Vandalism at the bus terminal

* In Los Angeles, California, 20 volunteers work at the UCLA Psychiatric Hospital, providing direct service to patients

* In Lincoln, Nebraska, 125 volunteers provide telephone reassurance

* In Limestone County, Alabama, 10 volunteers fingerprint children in a missing children's program

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

* In New York City, New York, 75 volnteers serv: the homeless

* In Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, 1 volunteer, a retired psychiatrist provic s 40 to 50 hours per week of counseling to Vietnam veterans.

These are but a handful of the hundreds of thousands of assignments carried out by RSVP volunteers nationally. The positive impact on the community, for the client, patient, student, and also for the senior volunteer is incalculable. The benefits for all are immeasurable. The cost to the taxpayer is negligible

The National Association of RSVP Directors is pleased that RSVP has continued to receive increased support by Members of Congress over the last fifteen years. Enhancement funds, which have been available to selected projects, and ACTION technical assistance regarding private sector resource development have been most helpful. In addition, we are also grateful to the thousands of other supporters, which include foundations, corporations, businesses, local governments, and over 30 states, which have provided funds and other resources. We know that in this era of limited federal dollars we have a responsibility to further develop these resources.

It is important to note that even with these resources, projects are being affected drastically by cuts in revenue-sharing. Some of our projects will lose 20% to 40% of their operating expenses. Our Association is working on a study to review the impact. In addition, passage of the **GRAMM-RUDMAN BILL** means additional cuts on the national level. We hope you will do all in your power so that RSVP and the other ACTION programs will not be affected dramatically by these bills.

Many RSVP programs have not received an increase in federal funding over the last sev n years. As a result many projects have made cutbacks in support to volunteers and in administrative costs. Gramm-Rudman will mean additional cuts. As decisions are made regarding the reauthorization, we hope that the bill will propose as few changes to existing law as possible, so that it can move through the process quickly. Even with Gramm-Rudman we recommend that the ceiling be increased by seven percent each year for the next three years. This would provide each project with increased dollars and enable expansion and continuation of efforts to address new initiative areas. We recommend the following ceilings:

1987	33.27
1988	35.60
1989	38.09

Each year the number of older people reaching retirement age increases. With these additional dollars we will be able to increase our senior volunteer personpo er. As well, additional funds will enable us to develop recruitment and placement of more skilled retirees.

We also ask that the position of Director of the Older American Volunteer Programs be upgraded to a Presidential appointment, with Senate confirmation. This would bring prestige to the position, thereby assisting the building of a national image for the Older American Volunteer Programs and gaining greater access to the private sector. Also in line with the issue of national image is the need to uncover what I consider a national secret-RSVP. It would be easier for local projects to raise dollars locally if businesses and foundations became more familiar with RSVP.

We understand that ACTION is proposing non-stipended Foster Grandparent and Senior Companion volunteers. It is the view of the National Association of RSVP Directors that such opportunities would dramatically change those two programs and effect RSVP as well. It would not be cost-free for SCP and FGP projects, as there would still be costs for administration and out-of-pocket expenses. It would duplicate what RSVP is presently doing and change the image of SCP and FGP as programs for low-income elderly. It would further create an inequity between stipended and non-stipended volunteers doing the same thing. If this non-stipended program is to be developed we would hope that ACTION would work closely with three National Older American Volunteer Program Director Associations in its design and implementation. This new concept can only be implemented if new dollars are provided. As volunteer administrators we know that volunteers are not free labor and we also recognize that seniors are a very special resource.

During the last reauthorization, Congress reduced from 50% to 30% the amount of local share contribution that was required to be raised by RSVP sponsors. We supported this move especially for projects in rural and low-income areas. However many projects continue to raise even more than 50% of their costs from local contributions.

We are strongly opposed to ACTION's request to increase the non-federal share to 50%. There is a great deal of testimony about the need to reduce the cap to 30% in the hearing records of both the House and Senate Committee hearings from 1983. The information presented then holds even more true today. With budget cuts to come, private sector resources will be stretched more than ever, and it will become increasingly harder to raise local funds.

Of course, there are Section 224-related ramifications here too, as raising the cap would reduce the amount of money available for local determination of expenditure. For both these reasons, we strongly oppose this suggested change.

The Levin-Roybal bill, currently before Congress, would encourage and enable older people to serve as education aides for children in public schools. Though we support this bill and hope that you move on this legislation, we ask that the program be administered by ACTION and not the Department of Education. RSVP has been involved in education, tutorial and intergenerational activities since its inception and would be a well-suited vehicle for operation of this project.

In closing, permit me to express my appreciation, on behalf of the National Association of RSVP Directors for having this opportunity to testify before you today.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you. Before I go to Betty, I want to ask you just one question—I will probably have several others—do you ever assign an RSVP volunteer to a project that performs somewhat the same functions or similar tasks as the Senior Companion and Foster Grandparent Programs?

Mr. SUGARMAN. Without a question, yes. However, we never place them in the same settings. We also modify the job descriptions. We do not expect 20 hours of service, and we do not provide the intensive training. We also are not able to offer the physicals and other benefits which SCP and FGP provide.

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you.

Betty.

Ms. MANLEY. Thank you very much, Senator Grassley, for inviting me here today.

I am a project director in San Jose, CA. I have been a director for 13 years, and I am also the vice president of the National Association of Foster Grandparent Directors.

I am representing Rita Katzman, who could not be here today, and I have submitted her testimony for the record, and I would like to add my own comments and answer questions that may be posed to me.

Our association does represent 75 percent of the programs in the Nation and its history and goals are included in the written testimony.

I would like to speak to a couple of issues today. No. 1 is that of the nonstipended volunteer. I feel that only the project director knows what it is really like to work with foster grandparents day by day. You know, we get a lot of our feeling of self-respect and self-worth in our society from our paychecks. And the foster grandparent is no different than anyone else. Whether we like that or not, that our paycheck is a measure of our self-worth, it is true.

You have never seen pride until you see a 75-year-old woman on payday, getting her paycheck that she has earned, and she knows she has earned it, and she looks you in the eye, and she squares her shoulders, and her eyes are sparkling like a teenager's. Sometimes—in fact, often—this is true in my program, and I have heard many other project directors talk about this—it is the first paycheck they have ever earned in their lives. That stipend to her is her paycheck. It goes a long way toward keeping her well. Her diet is improved. Her health care is improved. She can often practice preventive health care instead of going to the doctor when health conditions are much worse, and perhaps much more costly, and certainly, costly to her and the quality of her life.

We have some people who have elected not to go on SSI; instead, to be able to make it on their earned stipend as a foster grandparent. When I have questioned people about this because I feel that I need to let them know that there are these benefits for them, I have had the answer: "I know it is there, and I know I am entitled to it, but I want to be independent for as long as I can." I think we really need to encourage that with all of our low-income older people.

She is proud of what she does. And I am using the feminine pronoun because as you no doubt are aware, we work in my particular program with 85 percent women. She is proud, but she also wor-

ries—does she deserve it? Will she be seen as caring more about the money than about the children, because she does love the children.

We were part of a long-term research project that ACTION conducted sometime past. It went on for 5 years, and researchers would come out and ask our foster grandparents in certain settings questions. And one of the questions was: "Would you do this if you did not get the stipend?" And people came to me, really worried, worried about whether their answer was the right one, because they said: "I would like to, but I could not. I love the children, but I must have that stipend." They expressed real distress over that.

The program focuses on the poor and the vulnerable, and it gives those low-income people a chance to be of use in their retirement years by loving and caring for children who need them. That stipend is the means for them to do that. I think that we ought to be looking at ways to get the stipend for more people. We all have long waiting lists. Instead of looking for ways to not pay the stipend, so that more people can experience that joy, and wonder, and this gift to them at the end of their lives, which is the theme that runs through all of our programs. We hear them say: "I never dreamed I would get to do something so wonderful." They have often worked at very menial kinds of jobs during their lifetime. This is a wonderful new world that has opened up to them.

And then the heart of our program is that sustained, day-by-day, week-by-week, month-by-month, and sometimes year-by-year relationship with that child. But it is not a glamorous volunteer job, and it is not easy. Many foster grandparents are taking care of the basic physical needs of children. Some of the children—I am thinking here of abused and neglected children, sexually abused teenage girls—have been so hurt and so rejected that it may take weeks to get a response from those girls and from those children. But the foster grandparent hangs in there. They may want an easier child, or they might want a more attractive child. It is a characteristic of all of us that when we are most in need of love, we are perhaps most unlovable.

But they do hang in there. It is a job, and they are taking pride in it, and with support from us and with the stipend, they keep at it until the breakthrough comes, and then we see that tender exchange of love which is the hallmark of our program, and which so many people talk about when they talk about the Foster Grandparent Program.

I really question whether nonstipended volunteers in any numbers would do that. My experience, and the experience of many project directors that I have talked with—and I have discussed this at length with many directors—is that we do get an occasional person who says: "Oh, I really do not need a stipend. I want to do this." But when I explain to them that it is 20 hours a week, they say: "Oh, well, I could not do that. I would like to do it for 4 hours a week, or at most, 8 hours a week."

It seems to me that if the purpose of the nonstipend volunteer is to increase voluntarism in general, I am already doing that, and I am sure other project directors are, too. I refer people to RSVP very regularly. My own sponsoring agency, which is Catholic Social Service, has 900 volunteers in the course of a year, and I refer

them to Catholic Social Service programs so that their talents are not lost to voluntarism or to the society which needs them.

However, I do want to say that I have a great deal of contact with many volunteer programs in my community, both in my own agency and in my work as a Foster Grandparent Program director, and I see programs looking for ways to get some kind of reimbursement so that they can retain their volunteers. Volunteer retention is very, very difficult.

Now, on the other hand, if the purpose of the nonstipended volunteers is just add numbers of foster grandparents, I really question the legitimacy of that approach.

As my colleagues have mentioned, the nonstipended volunteer properly is an RSVP volunteer and even there, as mentioned, a free volunteer is not free; there are many costs associated with it. Frankly, I think being a volunteer coordinator is the hardest job on Earth, and I know a lot of volunteer coordinators who would agree with me.

That brings me to my second point—and I am only making two points today—and that is the constraints on administration to the Foster Grandparent Program. We have had no increases for 8 years. Measures that have been taken by project directors have been staff cuts, which means less support for foster grandparents, elimination or curtailing of other administrative functions. I even heard a foster grandparent director in California who gave a presentation to us at a recent conference, and she did not have copies of the form that she was illustrating use of, because her sponsor had locked up the Xerox machine, and she had used her share for the year. Some of us go out and spend our own money in cases like that, I must add.

Then also, there are caps on volunteer transportation, so that the volunteer is not getting true costs reimbursed, and in some extreme cases, directors are even cutting numbers of volunteers.

My own sponsor currently is paying 46 percent of the administration of our program. Any cuts would seriously disrupt the services of our program because of the extended position that we find ourselves in.

I think that when we talk about the local communities picking up the costs, private giving, resources, those resources do exist, but I do not think we are really looking realistically of what they are and what the demands are being made upon them. I can give you a very graphic personal example.

In Santa Clara County, the United Way Drive, after 5 years of double-digit increases, had an increase of 3½ percent this year. You can imagine our dismay, the service community in our county. And that is in affluent Silicon Valley. I have lived there all my life, and it was the Valley of Hearts' Delight at one time; now, it is Silicon Valley. In our community, some programs will die, and you can imagine what will happen in poorer areas. And the problems will still be with us—the costs to us all, to our society, in dollars and in wasted lives, will be more in the end.

I do want to comment on the testimony—that is all the testimony that I have prepared for today, but I want to comment on the testimony that I have heard this morning from ACTION. I, too, feel somewhat disadvantaged by not having that testimony previously.

What I would like to comment on is the wording related to the preamble.

I have no problem with the preamble as such, which calls for fostering volunteerism. But I think that that could be enlarged upon. As I have talked about, the focus of our program has been on the poor and the vulnerable, and I believe that this focus should be in the wording of the preamble.

I am also concerned about our ceiling level. The administration is asking for the ceiling level to be what is now our funding level, 56.1, and our ceiling level is 58.7. And I would like to ask that our funding level be raised to our current ceiling level, and not have our ceiling level cut. So that I would be opposed to reducing that.

I would be very happy to answer any questions, and I offer the resources of our association to work with your staff.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Katzman follows:]

National Association of Foster Grandparent Program Directors

TESTIMONY

Before the Senate Subcommittee on
Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism,
Committee on Labor and Human Resources, on
The Older American Volunteer Programs

February 6, 1986

Rita Katzman, President
National Association of
Foster Grandparent Program Directors
9851 Hamilton Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48202

TESTIMONY
February 6, 1986
Page 1

Senator Hawkins, members of the Committee, thank you for inviting me to submit testimony to this oversight hearing. I have prepared this lengthy statement which I request be made a part of the hearing record. My name is Rita Katzman, I am President of the National Association of Foster Grandparent Program Directors and Director of the Foster Grandparent Program in Detroit, Michigan.

The National Association of Foster Grandparent Program Directors has been in existence since 1971, and the membership currently totals 171, thus representing over 75% of the directors in the country today. The purpose of the organization is to provide a unified body to deal with concerns facing Older Americans and to work together toward improvement of the Foster Grandparent Program and the betterment of life for the foster grandparents. A fact sheet on the Association is attached to my statement. The program in Detroit is one of the original 21 such programs first funded in September, 1965, and it has grown to become one of the largest programs in the country serving 278 foster grandparents and 500 children and adolescents at the present time.

We are pleased to testify about the Foster Grandparent Program and to provide an overview of what is happening throughout the country. I would like to share with you a brief history of the Foster Grandparent Program, to discuss its evolvement over the past twenty years, to bring to your attention some difficulties the programs are facing in their attempts to maintain current operating levels and to address those issues raised in Senator Hawkins' letter of January 21, 1986.

In September, 1965, the first 21 Foster Grandparent Programs were funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity as a part of the Poverty Program. From its very inception the primary purpose of the program has been to create opportunities for meaningful activity for low-income seniors and to provide them with the means-- through the payment of a small stipend and provision for out-of-pocket expenses such as transportation, meals, etc.-- to volunteer on a daily basis.

When the first 21 Foster Grandparent Programs were initially funded, groups of foster grandparents (35-40) were placed in large institutional settings where they were assigned to provide one-to-one, ongoing and consistent relationships with mentally and/or physically impaired, emotionally disturbed or dependent and neglected youngsters. This, then, became the "traditional" type of program and remained so for several years with the senior volunteers, all of whom are low income, and sixty years of age or older, serving twenty hours per week, usually every morning, Monday through Friday. Management of the programs was fairly simple as a small staff could readily supervise the seniors assigned as they were in large groups within one or two volunteer stations.

It is important to stress that the provision of good, strong supervision for the foster grandparents is a key element in the success of these programs. This includes not only giving needed direction and support to the volunteers in their relationships with their assigned foster grandchildren, but in also assisting them in any other way that can aid in enriching their lives-- personal and/or family problems, housing and medical difficulties, legal needs, etc.

There have been spectacular and exciting changes in the Foster Grandparent Program since those beginnings, and there are 249 programs in operation today utilizing the talents and skills of 19,000 foster grandparents. The program has gradually taken on a much broader, community-based structure. This has enabled foster grandparents to serve children with a wide range of special and/or exceptional needs and has also served to demonstrate the true versatility of the senior volunteers and their ability to adapt to youngsters of all types, in a variety of settings and exhibiting many levels of behavior.

As an example of the above, and using my own program in Detroit as a demonstration of these changes, we currently have 278 foster grandparents placed in over 35 volunteer settings plus 35 individual foster or private home sites. These settings include: State institutions and nursing homes with retarded youngsters; day care centers; hospitals-- pediatric inpatient, child psychiatric and neo-natal intensive care units; residential

treatment facilities for emotionally disturbed children and adolescents; schools for the blind, the deaf, the learning disabled, the special education child or the student with problem behavior; group home settings with runaway youth, troubled youngsters, abused children, substance abusers, delinquents; headstart programs; shelters for battered women and children; school sites and homes for teenage parents and their babies; juvenile justice sites (training schools, detention facilities); private, foster, group homes with developmentally disabled or abused children.

This is but a partial listing of the sort of experiences facing foster grandparents today. And with the strong emphasis on deinstitutionalization that exists and continues to grow across the country, there are fewer appropriate institutional placements available for the senior volunteer. Programs must incorporate more community based settings and must look toward developing more home assignments for foster grandparents if we are to best meet the needs in society as they are today. These are the new directions for the Foster Grandparent Program.

Along with these changes come others that affect overall program operation. Supervision that was adequate for groups of foster grandparents placed within one or two settings can no longer be effective when that same staff must cover that same, or an increasing number, of seniors assigned to 6-10 settings. This is no longer a program where foster grandparents serve only during morning hours. Seniors are now assigned any day of the week as appropriate for the setting and the senior and any where from 8:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M. As the number of sites increases, the strain on transportation needs also increases many-fold. The training needed by the foster grandparents must be as varied as the type of placements utilized.

As can be seen the Foster Grandparent Program has evolved into a most dynamic, diversified program offering a wide variety of service opportunities to the seniors who are a part of it and who give so freely of themselves to others. And, as you well know, the number of low income elderly continues to increase with each passing year. Changes must be made if the program is to meet these expanding needs among our Older American population.

The budget reduction mandated under the Gramm/Rudman Bill will be most devastating to the Foster Grandparent Program and the senior volunteers. Program resources are presently stretched far beyond their limits, and the majority of programs will find it extremely difficult to survive and/or to maintain quality operation should they experience massive funding cutbacks. The needs in our communities and among our Older Americans must be addressed and Gramm/Rudman will forestall all efforts to do so.

The National Association was so very pleased with the 1984 legislation and the many gains enjoyed by the programs and the foster grandparents as a result. We are indeed grateful for the fine support and the recognition received from the members of the Committee and its awareness of the growing needs of the programs. Needless to say we were delighted to see our volunteers receive a twenty cent per hour stipend increase and to see this extended to all foster grandparents, including non-ACTION funded seniors in both ACTION and non-ACTION funded programs. Section 224, which provides greater flexibility in budgeting to local programs, was a provision that the three national OAVP Directors Associations had strived toward for quite sometime. We have been working closely with ACTION in this area, and particularly of late a great deal of headway and progress is being made in moving ahead with the implementation of Section 224. We also acknowledge the responsibility of the community-based sponsors of the Foster Grandparent Program on the local level and the role they should be playing in developing and allocating resources for all areas of program operation.

Foster Grandparent Program Sponsors and directors have long recognized and acknowledged their role in as well as the need for seeking local and private sector support. It is vital that we become aware of the fierce level of competition for such resources and the fact that the availability of such funds is rapidly diminishing. Communities are experiencing reductions in their revenue sharing allocations, state and local agencies have fewer dollars for programs and private sector resources can be stretched only so far. Although Foster Grandparent Programs have been successful in obtaining monies from

the above sources to augment their budgets, no existing program can continue to operate without the support received from ACTION. Limited private sector resources coupled with Gramm/Rudman mandated cuts could surely be the downfall of many Foster Grandparent Programs.

In terms of the future, our Authorization expires September 30, 1986, and we would hope that Congress would provide a three year extension of our program, thus enabling more Older Americans to benefit from participation in it and allowing even greater service to special/exceptional needs children. To do so there is a need for an increase in our authorization level. Our current ceiling for funding is $58.7 million while our funding level currently stands at $56.1 million.

We feel there is the need for a reasonable increase in that ceiling if we are to make room for growth and further diversity thus allowing us to meet expanding community needs as well as serve the increasing number of low income seniors in need of such service. Many programs are experiencing large waiting lists of foster grandparent applicants while the number of vacant positions within the programs remain relatively small. In Detroit alone we maintain a list of over 150 seniors eligible for participation as foster grandparents, and for most of them the wait is well over 12-16 months before an opening occurs. In addition, seniors are remaining with the program for longer periods of time, and as the programs age, so do the foster grandparents. Programs must be expanded to enable bringing in new and younger volunteers to the sites and thus allow for future survival of the programs. And, the numbers of special/exceptional needs youngsters in our communities who could benefit from a foster grandparent relationship is limitless.

We are not, therefore, advocating major changes in the Reauthorization Bill other than a strong recommendation for the increase in our funding ceiling, as ACTION is still involved in implementing those changes designated in the 1984 legislation. The Association would like to recommend that the position of Director of Older American Volunteer Programs be upgraded to that of a Presidential Appointee, requiring Senate confirmation. This would

then insure that the national head of the Older American Volunteer Programs can be afforded the stature and prestige deserved by this position and can have better access to corporate and private sector funding sources. This is most assuredly a direction that all three OAVP Programs will continue taking, keeping in mind the limitations discussed earlier, and the national head of the program will need to play an essential part in developing inroads into these private sector resources. As indicated above, it is also hoped that Congress will provide an extension of the Foster Grandparent Program and that serious consideration will be given to raising our ceiling to the recommended level.

A proposal is being considered within ACTION to promote growth of the Foster Grandparent Program through the use of non-stipended volunteers. Although the Association is indeed eager to see program expansion and to serve greater numbers of low-income seniors, to do so utilizing non-stipended volunteers would place increasing stress on already severely limited budget resources. Although a stipend would not be paid, other program benefits-- daily transportation, supervision, insurance coverage, etc.-- would need to be available to new volunteers. And, as will be discussed later, programs are currently experiencing serious constraints in these areas. One of the truly unique aspects of the service provided to special/exceptional needs youngsters by the foster grandparents is the consistent, one-to-one relationship developed between the old and young on a twenty hour per week basis. Experience has proven that, for the most part, non-stipended volunteers do not, nor will not, commit themselves to this same degree of involvement. Program guidelines mandate that a foster grandparent serve the 20 hours per week, and this is a format that has, throughout the 20 years of the program's existence, proven to be of extreme value to both the foster grandparents and the children they serve. Just recently within my own program a foster grandfather, who had been with the program more than 6 years was no longer eligible to receive the stipend as his pension income increased beyond the acceptable limit. He decided to continue with us on a non-stipended basis. Within a few short weeks, however, he began requesting a reduction in his service hours and gradually withdrew completely from the program. The retention rate

for the majority of non-stipended volunteers is far less. In addition, the personnel at the sites where the volunteers relate with the youngsters are very strong in advocating the 20-hour per week format, and they stress the vital importance of the consistent, ongoing, daily relationships that are developed by the foster grandparents with these special children. And, I cannot emphasize strongly enough that the Foster Grandparent Program was designed to meet the needs of the low-income senior, and it is the stipend that allows the foster grandparents to remain independent, self-sufficient and self supporting. Many of them would be in nursing homes or on welfare roles were it not for the benefits received from the Foster Grandparent Program. Can we expect the same quality of programs if stipended and non-stipended volunteers should be forced into situations of serving together within the same sites? I think not.

To promote expansion of the Foster Grandparent Program through the use of non-stipended volunteers coupled with an easing of the low-income status would lead to the destruction of the Foster Grandparent Program. The Retired Senior Volunteer Program is designed to provide service opportunities to the non-stipended senior volunteer. The National Association of Foster Grandparent Program Directors, at our Board meeting in October, 1985, voted in opposition of utilizing non-stipended volunteers within the Foster Grandparent Program and strongly recommends and urges that such volunteers become a component of RSVP. But, if RSVP is asked to take on increased numbers of volunteers, it, too, will require additional funding resources to do so.

Madam Chairman, there are some circumstances we would like to bring to the Committee's attention, and of prime importance among these are the severe administrative constraints facing most Foster Grandparent Programs today. There have been no funding increases for most programs, other than those monies earmarked for the raise in stipends for the volunteers, in the past 6-8 years. Programs are experiencing serious difficulties in maintaining current levels of volunteers. And, for each foster grandparent lost to the program so, too, are the special children in need of a foster grandparent relationship.

Programs cannot develop the type and level of supervision that is required for strong operation with new and expanding community-based settings.

In addition, provision of adequate daily transportation for our volunteers is becoming virtually impossible. Last year one director reported to me that although her transportation budget would be expended by the end of May, her program year ran through November. This is but one example of what is occurring nationwide. Directors are being forced into a situation where they must meet 1985 transportation and other costs with 1977-78 allocation levels when gas was 50 cents a gallon.

Directors are being faced with decisions involving cutbacks in the number of seniors who are able to participate in the program, and this should not be necessary. We should be serving greater numbers of seniors and youngsters, not fewer. The emphasis on deinstitutionalization in our communities dictates future directions of the Foster Grandparent Program. If we are to adequately meet these new challenges, we must have the necessary resources to do so appropriately and professionally.

Keeping in mind the financial constraints indicated above, it becomes increasingly difficult to project how mandated budget reductions can be achieved without serious disruption in services as provided by the Foster Grandparent Program to the foster grandparents and the exceptional and/or special needs children with whom they relate. It is our fervent hope that it will not become necessary to terminate any foster grandparents from our programs nor lessen the services provided to them or the youngsters.

The reality, however, is that Domestic Services programs like ours are facing possible budget reductions of up to 25 percent for fiscal 1987 if Gramm/Rudman does indeed go into effect according to a recent House Aging Committee analysis. Rather than cut the heart out of programs such as Foster Grandparent Program with "nickel and dime" budget reductions Congress must look seriously at alternative methods of reducing the deficit. We must preserve the integrity and quality of the Foster Grandparent Program as well as the dignity of the foster grandparents. And, we must continue to serve our

two very needy, and constantly increasing populations-- low income seniors and special/ exceptional needs youngsters.

Senator Hawkins, I would like to thank you and the members of the Committee for giving the National Association of Foster Grandparent Program Directors the opportunity to share with you our concerns and our hopes for the future. You have asked us to comment on specific issues, and we have attempted to incorporate our responses throughout this testimony. We are most grateful for your interest and support.

Rita Katzman
President

National Association of Foster Grandparent Program Directors

President
Rita Rodjenen
ACTION
1111 Hamilton Avenue
Oxford, U.S. 12121
(111) 111-1111

Vice President
Betty Hanley
ACTION
1111 The Alexander Route 1
San Jose, U.S. 95121
(111) 111-1111

Secretary
Jane Jones
ACTION
111 Elizabeth Road
Rinder, U.S. 12121
(111) 111-1111

Treasurer
Charles L. Nathan
ACTION
P.O. Box 111
Middlesex, U.S. 12121
(111) 111-1111

HISTORY:
The National Association of Foster Grandparent Program Directors (NAFGPD) was created in December, 1971, in Washington, D.C., at a meeting of directors attending a national training conference. It developed from a need felt by many Foster Grandparent Program directors to have an organization that would address itself to their collective needs and concerns relative to the betterment of the programs and enrichment of the lives of the foster grandparents. Officers were elected and charged with developing By-laws and operating practices. Those directives were achieved in early 1972, and the NAFGPD has actively represented the needs of Foster Grandparent Program Directors nation-wide since that time.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of the National Association of Foster Grandparent Program Directors is: to provide an opportunity for expression, support and a unified voice for the Foster Grandparent Programs; to provide a means for communication between the Foster Grandparent Programs and related organizations, agencies and local, state, regional and federal funding sources; to explore areas of general interest affecting senior citizens; to provide a vehicle to encourage coordinated, creative and unduplicated services to solve problems; to act as a resource and make available technical assistance to Foster Grandparent Directors and sponsors, ACTION and other community groups as needed and deemed appropriate.

STRUCTURE AND OPERATION:
Active, professional membership is open to all Foster Grandparent Program Directors, coordinators and supervisors. Active members have voting privileges. Associate membership is open to all non-program staff and other interested persons or groups who share the desire to promote the program. Associate members do not have voting privileges.

NAFGPD is operated through a Board of Directors. The Board of Directors is composed of nationally elected officers. (President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer) and a regional representative elected by the paid members of each of the ACTION outlined regions.

The Board of Directors meets twice a year in Washington, D.C. Financial constraints have made it impossible to hold annual meetings of the total membership, although general meetings are held whenever an ACTION sponsored national training conference is scheduled. Regional membership meetings are held to coincide with regional ACTION sessions.

AREAS OF INVOLVEMENT:

Since its inception the NAFGPD has had significant impact on the operation and development of the Foster Grandparent Program nationwide. The association has been instrumental in:

---securing increased appropriations for the Foster Grandparent Program.
---obtaining stipend increases for the volunteers.
---influencing revision of the guidelines utilized to govern program operations.
---insuring greater flexibility of individual program use of locally raised funds.
---serving as an advocate for Older Americans.
---communicating on issues relevant to the programs and Older Americans.

July, 1985

Dr. DOCKSAI. Thank you very much, Ms. Manley. We will take advantage of that.

Thank you all very much for your very thoughtful testimony.

There were several questions Senator Grassley asked us to deliver if he had not gotten back in time. First of all, the turnover rate, Ms. Manley, if you could comment a little bit on the length of stay of a volunteer in your program. And let me ask first of all, the 900 members of Catholic Social Services, is that just San Jose?

Ms. MANLEY. No; it is the county.

Dr. DOCKSAI. The county?

Ms. MANLEY. Yes; that is 900 volunteers in the course of a year.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Could you comment, please, on the turnover rate, how long a volunteer stays with your program?

Ms. MANLEY. I cannot make a statistical comment. I can say to you that they stay until they are unable to be foster grandparents any more, until they feel too frail themselves, and in some very sad situations where I must say: "I feel you are too frail to continue; your health will not allow this."

We had an 81-year-old woman who came in at 81 and applied to the program. Her daughter-in-law was already in the program. And when I told her she would probably have to wait a year—which she did—she said, "Oh, that is all right. It gives me something to look forward to." She is 91 now and still working at Juvenile Hall. She was the subject of a newspaper columnist's article a couple of years ago that was headed, "Nobody Cusses Grandma." They just do not go. They get so much satisfaction out of it.

I have focused on the stipend, but the other rewards are there, that exchange of affection, that seeing the need of the child and knowing how much that child needs that.

One of our foster grandfathers said one time: "I feel as though I love them more than my own grandchildren because their need is so great."

We have people who have been with us 14 years—that is how long our program has been in existence—many people who have been with us over 10 years. And that continuity is so important to the children and to the success of the program.

Mr. SUGARMAN. Could I also speak on the issue of retention?

Dr. DOCKSAI. Yes, certainly.

Mr. SUGARMAN. Thank you; I think it is a very important issue. In the magazine Voluntary Action Leadership, they have discussed that amongst adult volunteers, about one out of every four volunteers will leave a program where they are volunteering during 1 year's period. I think among senior volunteers, retention rate is much higher but RSVP staff play an important role in this regard. Older people stay with the volunteer job longer. They are often much more committed to the volunteer assignment. However, our ability to expand recruitment is limited when we do not have the staff resources volunteer expenses to carry out the recruitment. As we must be there to give the active volunteers support, we are unable to recruit more volunteers to increase our numbers if no new dollars are forthcoming. If we want to continue to promote retention of present volunteers and at the same time build numbers, additional dollars are essential.

Dr. DOCKSAI. And there is no discernible difference in urgency between, let us say, dichotomy of rural versus urban, or——

Mr. SUGARMAN. There are many differences between urban and rural projects, but I think retention rates amongst all senior volunteers are very, very high.

Like Betty, we are recruiting volunteers who are in their seventies and eighties, and they stay with us for 10, 12 years and more. In RSVP, in New York City, we have 150 volunteers over the age of 90 in our programs, and that number continues to swell. We are keeping them healthier by keeping them active, and we believe that the healthier older people are bound to stay with their volunteer work longer in both urban and rural areas.

Dr. DOCKSAI. I was with Senator Hatch about 2 years ago in that same program in the Bronx—and in fact, we did one in Salt Lake City, as well; they did not get to Kentucky, unfortunately, and the budget situation being the way it is now, we probably never will. But nonetheless, I was looking at the program, and they had waiting lists at the two centers for foster grandparents. Is that the case as well in San Jose?

Ms. MANLEY. That is right; some people have waiting lists of as many as 100 or 150 people, and it is not unusual at all in my own program to have to wait at least 1 year. That is another point for increasing stipended volunteer opportunities, and that is that we really need those "young" 60-year-olds in our programs, because we need fresh energy.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Thank you very much again.

We will include additional statements in the record at this point as well as follow up questions.

[Additional material subsequently supplied for the record follows:]

Ky

Statement of Senator Edward M. Kennedy
Reauthorization of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act

February 6, 1986

I would like to commend Senator Hawkins for holding this hearing which begins the process of reauthorizing the Domestic Volunteer Service Act. The programs under this Act provide critical opportunities to address the problems of poverty in our country and to utilize the many skills of older Americans. I would like to extend a special welcome to Ira Greif from my home State of Massachusetts who is here to tell the Subcommittee how the VISTA program is helping the homeless in Boston. Mr. Greif is in charge of an exemplary program and I look forward to reviewing his testimony.

Volunteers in Service To America authorized under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act and administered by ACTION, is the Federal Government's only full-time domestic anti-poverty volunteer program. Since VISTA's inception in 1963 as part of the original war on poverty, this program has been a triumph of self-help for America's poor. Unique among the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, VISTA does not offer funding -- it offers people -- the concern, the expertise and the caring of Americans for our brothers and sisters in need. Today we are proud of the 2400 VISTA volunteers serving in rural and urban areas, helping people who need help the most.

We have had to work hard over the past five years in Congress to preserve this legacy of commitment and voluntary action. We all know that VISTA has been cut by two-thirds since 1980, and there have been many attempts by this Administration to eliminate it. I am pleased that the 1987 Administration's budget provides funding for this important program but I am deeply concerned that the 1987 VISTA funding level may not maintain the 2400 volunteers that are now serving in the program. It is my hope that reauthorization of VISTA will include, at the very least, an amount which will support the current number of volunteer service hours. I plan to work hard to perserve the VISTA funding floor which reflects Congress' historical support for VISTA as a priority program. I look forward to a reauthorization which reaffirms VISTA's anti-poverty focus and which encourages volunteers to serve in needy areas all across the country as well as in local communities.

The National Older American Volunteer Programs, also included in this reauthorization, are successful, cost effective programs that tap one of this nation's most underused resource - the expertise of older Americans. The Retired Senior Volunteer Service Projects, the Foster Grandparent Program, and the Senior Companion programs utilize the skills of older Americans to help people of all ages who are in need. Many older Americans volunteer their time and efforts to help children who are disabled, to aid needy elderly individuals, and to serve in community programs. The older Americans who participate as volunteers reap many benefits from their experiences and those people in need find their lives changed because of the commitments of these older Americans.

Each individual can make a difference. VISTA and the Older Americans programs have brought lasting change to millions of low-income citizens. Time and again these programs have provided a "hand-up" rather than a "hand-out" to our fellow human beings. It is our responsibility to preserve, protect and enhance these critical programs over the next few years. I pledge my efforts to securing a reauthorization that reaffirms our strong commitment to programs which bring hope for a better life to all those left out and left behind.

Margaret L. Petito
5124 Nebraska Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

April 4, 1986

Sen. Paula Hawkins
Chair, Subcommittee on Children, Family,
Drugs and Alcoholism
428 Senate Dirksen Office Bldg.
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Hawkins:

I am writing to request that my letter become part of the official Subcommittee Hearing Record on the reauthorization of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act.

The VISTA program continues to be a cost-effective social service program in these United States -reaching with quiet strength into various communities.

This is the type of program that we should support and an increased commitment will insure its continued success. It's goals are outstanding and from its inception has furthered the cause of neighbor helping neighbor better than any other.

From 1972 through 1974, as a VISTA volunteer, I served a small but outstaning organization in upstate New York, designing and implementing community programs where there had been none before. This county does not have one source of real employment any more save farming (poor) and tourism.No industry, no prospects. Still the programs which were begun (health clinics, rural transportation, emergency relief, student counselling and recreation, etc.) continue today without any federal funding - run solely on the structure we first established, that of neighbor helping neighbor.

The VISTA program can and does provide this kind of leadership and technical know-how to our towns and cities. I ask that you continus to support its goals. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Margaret L. Petito

Margaret L. Petito
(202) 537-1327

RESPONSES OF THE ADMINISTRATION TO SUBSEQUENT QUESTIONS

Question: **One of the main issues before us this year as we consider the reauthorization of ACTION is whether to amend the Act to permit non-stipend volunteers to participate in the Foster Grandparent and Senior Companion programs. Frankly, most of the people I have talked to on this issue weren't aware that participation in these programs was limited to low-income individuals. I can understand why the stipend that the federal government pays to these elderly volunteers should be limited to the low-income, but with all the individuals out there that need the care and attention of foster grandparents and senior companions, what is the rationale for denying those who want to work without reimbursement from participating in the program?**

Answer: Currently, the authorizing legislation for SCP and FGP stipulates the programs are "designed for the purpose of providing opportunities for low-income persons aged sixty . . ." Thus, only low-income persons may be enrolled in the Programs as Foster Grandparents and Senior Companions. We would like to change this situation by allowing persons of higher incomes to participate without a stipend. We feel that allowing non-stipended volunteers to serve would result in the expansion of volunteer services in the Foster Grandparent and Senior Companion Programs beyond what we can now provide under current appropriation. Furthermore, as indicated in the level funding requests for these programs in 1987, we fully intend to implement such an expansion without any dimunition of services or adverse effect to existing stipended volunteer service year levels.

-1-

Question: **Do you have any difficulty finding individuals who want to work in the foster grandparent or senior companion program? Do you have a waiting list of volunteers?**

Answer: In FY 1984, a survey indicated some 5,000 low-income elderly persons on waiting lists for enrollment as Foster Grandparents, an average of approximately 20 per project. This figure in no way reflects the total number of persons eligible and willing to serve as Foster Grandparents, however due to the fact that local FGP project sponsors, in general, do not seek longer waiting lists in order to avoid creating false hope of an opportunity to enroll since the number of stipends available is limited.

In FY 1985, 74 local SCP projects reported 1,486 applicants put on project waiting lists, an average of 20 per project. Individual projects report a range of 2 to 150 eligible persons. Many projects intentionally restrict the numbers of their waiting lists since their turn-over is minimal and persons could wait several years before enrolling.

Question: **Your waiting list is composed of individuals who meet the income-eligibility criteria. Do you keep lists of individuals who are not low income, who want to volunteer without any reimbursement?**

Answer: We do not have data on the number of over-income persons who have expressed a desire to serve as Foster Grandparents and Senior Companions. However, responses to radio and television interviews and other media events indicate that there is a high degree of interest in these Programs by persons not income eligible. To date, we have encouraged our projects to refer such individuals to other volunteer opportunities that may exist in their communities. We trust that they will form the first wave of senior volunteers who serve without stipends as Foster Grandparents and Senior Companions when it is permissible.

Question: Our first lady, Nancy Reagan, helped increase the public's awareness of the foster grandparent program. I am sure that many of the people who read her book, "To Love a Child" were moved to call and volunteer their time and talents. What was the response given to these generous people? "Sorry we can't use you?"

Answer: We make every effort to refer persons not eligible to serve as Foster Grandparent or Senior Companion volunteers to other volunteer activities such as RSVP and community agencies which provide volunteer opportunities for older Americans. However,it is not always possible to place such persons in programs which assist the same at-risk populations as Foster Grandparents and Senior Companions.

Obviously, the lack of positive encouragement tends to keep down the numbers of persons who would identify themselves as willing to serve as non-stipended volunteers.

Question: If we do amend the law to permit non-stipended volunteers for these two older American programs, I want to make sure that they supplement, not supplant the low-income stipended volunteers. Do you believe that you can develop language that would insure that the non-stipended volunteer never replaces a low-income volunteer?

Answer: Persons not in the low-income category serving without stipend under this part shall not replace low-income volunteers serving with stipend.

The proposed language in the Administration bill states that "persons not in the low-income category may serve as "Foster Grandparents" without stipend or reimbursement for other than transportation, meals, and other out-of-pocket expenses incident to the provision of services, which expenses shall be paid from non-Federal funds."

As the language specifies, no Federal funds will be used to support out-of-pocket expenses of non-stipend volunteers. Therefore, all Federal dollars will be used to support low-income stipend volunteers. This language would prevent the possibility of supplanting stipended volunteers with non-stipended volunteers.

Question: Can you develop language that would ensure that the two types of volunteers are treated the same, without special treatment being afforded to either category?

Answer: We do not envision that these concerns will develop into a problem, but as a precautionary measure, the following is proposed as legislative or report language:

"In accordance with any regulations which the Director may prescribe, this shall not be construed to grant or create any special privileges or special status among volunteers, stipended or non-stipended."

Question: A great deal of well-deserved attention has been focused on the Foster Grandparent program because of the First Lady's work, but the other ACTION programs also deserve merit. I know that in Florida, ACTION funds programs with Vietnam Veterans, refugees, and drug prevention. What other type of programs is ACTION involved in?

Answer:

OAVP

Within the Older American Volunteer Programs (OAVP), ACTION administers two additional programs: the Senior Companion Program (SCP) and the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP).

The efforts of Senior Companion volunteers are directed at providing supportive in-home services to the frail and "at-risk" elderly. The SCP recipients are at risk due to disabling or terminal disease, alcoholism or drug-related problems, or are recovering from procedures performed during a recent stay in an acute care hospital.

Retired Senior volunteers provide a vast array of services. Of special emphasis are services to youth, literacy, and the recruitment and placement of volunteers with special skills.

VISTA

As of January 31, 1986, there were 67 VISTA Volunteers serving on 10 projects in the State of Florida. VISTAs serve in cities such as Orlando, St. Petersburg, Miami, Gainsville, and Tallahassee. In addition to veterans, refugees, and drug prevention activities, VISTA activities include: developing of self-help support groups for parents of abused or neglected children, coordination of community volunteers to provide transportation for the elderly and disabled, and mobilizing older adults as grandparents to work on a one-to-one basis with low-income delinquent and emotionally disturbed youth.

FLORIDA VISTA PROJECTS

	No. of Vols
1-Alachua County Center for Voluntary Action Gainsville, FL	3
2-Volunteer Service Bureau Orlando, FL	2
3-Thee Door of Central Florida Orlando, FL	5
4-Gulf Coast Jewish Family Service St. Petersburg, FL	9
5-Daily Bread Community Food Bank Miami, FL	12
6-Latin Chamber of Commerce Miami, FL	10
7-Parents Anonymous of North Florida Tallahassee, FL	4
8-Florida Informed Parents Tallahassee, FL	20
9-Catholic Social Services Tampa, FL	2
10-Tri-County Community Council Bonifay, FL	0

PART C

The specific programs operated with Part C funds are the MiniGrant Program; the State Office of Voluntarism Program, formerly the State Office of Voluntary Citizen Participation Program; the Technical Assistance Program; and the Demonstration Grant Program. These programs afford ACTION the opportunity to test new and innovative ways of using volunteers to address a wide range of local needs; provide seed monies to initiate volunteer programming in local neighborhoods; develop how-to materials for nationwide distribution; and create statewide offices to promote voluntarism.

Emphasis areas for Part C funding under the current Administration have been drug use prevention, literacy, runaway and homeless youth, neighborhood development, refugees, youth services, Texas Rio Grande Valley, veterans, general poverty programs, latchkey, child abuse, and energy conservation.

Question: **What is the Extent of ACTION's involvement in the Drug Prevention program?**

VISTA

Answer: VISTA complies with the President's Federal Drug strategy through activities undertaken by VISTA Volunteers assigned to local public and private non-profit organizations. These activities include peer counseling to high school students, establishing alcohol/drug prevention projects in the community and in schools, and creating community awareness of the hazards of alcohol/drug abuse.

As of December 31, 1985, there were 464 VISTA Volunteers serving on 78 alcohol/drug abuse prevention projects. We estimate that these numbers will remain approximately the same during FY 1986.

As of September 30, 1985, 20% of Young Volunteers In ACTION (YVA) projects were working in these areas.

OAVP

An estimated 426 Foster Grandparent volunteers are currently involved in assisting children with problems related to drug and substance abuse. These volunteers provide counseling, act as adult role models, and help in the delivery of drug therapy programs to their assigned children.

A total of 3,500 RSVP volunteers are involved in treatment, counseling, and rehabilitation programs for alcoholics and drug abusers as well as their families. Their activities include preventive education and information dissemination on alcoholism and drug abuse. An increase of 4,900 RSVP volunteers engaged in these activities is projected for the end of FY 1986.

PART C

ACTION has produced a series of drug prevention pamphlets on the health consequences of marijuana, cocaine and alcohol and a "Youth Leader's Guide" for nationwide distribution.

The Agency has launched several major private-sector initiatives. Most noteworthy is the "Pharmacists Against Drug Abuse" (PADA) campaign (a program designed by ACTION for McNeil Pharmaceuticals). Additionally, ACTION sponsored the first White House Conference on Drug Use and the Family for 200 corporate and organizational leaders and designed programs in conjunction with the Elks, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, American Medical Association Auxilliary, etc.

ACTION has organized members of the entertainment industry to support drug use prevention efforts, including the production and distribution of a series of nine award-winning public service announcements featuring celebrities such as Mrs. Reagan, Mr. T, Brooke Shields, Adrienne Barbeau, David Hasslehoff and the Gremlins.

ACTION has focused demonstration grant funds on assisting fragmented parent groups throughout individual states by forming coordinated statewide coalitions, conducting conferences, and supporting a major national resource center which has a nationwide toll-free number.

Question: **How are you complying with the President's Federal Drug strategy?**

Answer: Since 1981, ACTION has taken an active role in implementing the President's Federal Strategy on Drug Abuse by mobilizing volunteers in drug use education and prevention efforts. ACTION stimulates voluntary and private-sector participation in drug prevention programs and, in conjunction with state and local organizations, disseminates current information on the health hazards and social efforts of drugs and alcohol.

Specific ACTION program involvement in carrying out the President's Federal Strategy of Drug Abuse is delineated in the response to the preceding question.

Question: **Last year, the priority areas that your agency identified were projects dealing with homeless and hungry. What kind of volunteer programs did ACTION undertake to address these problems?**

Answer:

OAVP

Two hundred thirty-eight (238) RSVP projects have senior volunteers actively engaged with food banks and with the gleaning of surplus fruit and vegetables from local farms. Food that is not saleable, due to damaged packaging or mislabeling, etc., are collected from food stores and distributed to community entities responsible for feeding homeless and hungry people.

VISTA

As of December 31, 1985, there were 330 VISTA Volunteers serving on 72 VISTA homeless/shelter projects. Volunteer activities include mobilizing community volunteer involvement in homeless shelter activities, developing permanent housing and employment counseling programs for residents of shelters, setting up health delivery services for shelter residents, and organizing community support systems for the homeless mentally ill.

As of December 31, 1985, there were 554 volunteers serving on 128 hunger/food projects. Volunteer activities include providing outreach and technical assistance for food banks and other food distribution centers, recruiting other community groups to solicit food from wholesalers and retailers, and establishing food production programs, e.g. urban gardens, in communities where none exist.

PART C

The following list reflects the number of Part C demonstration projects (for FY 1985 and FY 1986 up through 2/86) addressing specific issue areas:

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention	13
Employment	5
Homeless	3
Literacy	3
Hunger	2

Other Categories

Youth Related:		14
Child Abuse	(2)	
Latchkey	(4)	
Adoption	(1)	
Youth Support Services	(7)	

We will soon publish a Request for Proposals in the Federal Register which will include the following focus areas: literacy and employment training for youth, runaway youth, refugee assistance, independent living for foster care graduates, assistance to farm families in crisis and drug use prevention.

In addition, ACTION Regional Directors have been instructed to seek out innovative proposals at the State and Regional level.

Question: The biennial evaluation of VISTA, how long does your study take?

Answer: Impact evaluations take two to five years as they require multiple data collections from the same sample of persons or projects to enable measurement of the research areas over time.

A contract for the VISTA Goal Accomplishment and Community Effects Evaluation was let in September 1985 to design the evaluation. The design of this evaluation will be completed by April 1986. The evaluation will involve 45 projects in their second year. The first round of data collection will begin in September 1986, and the second and final round of data collection will begin one year later in September 1987. The final report will be ready for release in May 1988.

Question: Does that mean that in order to comply with Congressional mandates a new study must begin even before the current study is analyzed or even completed?

Answer: Yes. Impact evaluations are almost always longitudinal evaluations that take two to five years to complete. The "biennial" stipulation requires that evaluations of programs be started while one or more evaluations are still being conducted. This strains the available staff and funding resources. An increase in the time between evaluations would alleviate this situation.

Question: What are your priority areas this year?

Answer: ACTION emphasizes use of its resources towards alleviation of hunger, homelessness, illiteracy, and youth unemployment. In addition, we address the needs of refugees, migrants, runaways and we seek to help in drug abuse and prevention and rehabilitation of drug users.

The Agency also maintains keen interest in the plight of unwed low-income teen mothers.

Further, ACTION fosters a detailed interest in youth voluntarism, especially in student programs that are located on campuses.

We recognize the great need to be in the vanguard of the President's call for greater, more effective voluntarism, and we have begun a systematic course of training that will impart fundamentals of self-sufficiency, volunteer-organization management and the advancement of voluntarism.

Question: Senator Hatch is quite an advocate of the Senior Companion program, he was the chief individual responsible for increasing the funding for this program last year. Have you completed implementing the expansion of the Senior Companion programs?

Answer: Yes, I am pleased to report that in August and September 1985, ACTION funded 19 new projects with 847 volunteer service years and 17 components to existing SCP's with an additional 189 volunteer service years. The new projects range from 21 to 65 volunteers and the components range from 10 to 15 new volunteers. Twenty-five states and jurisdictions are involved in this exciting new effort.

Question: The authority for the Advisory Council for your Agency is scheduled to expire this year, during your tenure at ACTION have you found the Advisory Council useful? Would you favor its continued existence?

Answer: The Advisory Council significantly contributes to the Agency's ability to accomplish its mission and I strongly favor its continued existence.

The Council members donate their time and access to local resources which secures local and regional support for voluntarism. Their advice helps gain private sector sponsorship for proven volunteer programs. Moreover, their many initiatives aid in expanding community volunteer programs and this assures that projects become self-sufficient. One of the most important events during National Volunteer Week is the presentation of the President's Volunteer Action Awards, at the White House. The judging of the most outstanding volunteers in America is performed by ACTION's Advisory Council.

VISTA/ACTION Funding Levels

Question: **How do you intend to make the 4.3% budget cuts required in FY 86 under Gramm-Rudman?**

Answer: As stipulated in the legislation and in guidance from the Office of Management and Budget, the 4.3% Gramm-Rudman reduction has been applied to each program.

Question: **Please provide for the record a program by program account of the cuts you intend to make?**

Answer: The reductions by program are as follows:

VISTA	$ 817,000
Service-Learning Programs	59,000
Voluntary Citizen Participation and Volunteer Demonstration Programs	77,000
Older American Volunteer Programs	4,464,000
Foster Grandparent Program	(2,412,000
Retired Senior Volunteer Program	(1,274,000
Senior Companion Program	(778,000
Program Administration	1,088,000
	$6,505,000

Question: **What will be VISTA's budget following the 4.3% cut?**

Answer: VISTA's revised budget is 18,183,000.

Question: **Specifically, for VISTA please provide a breakdown of the VISTA budget, after FY 86 Gramm-Rudman cuts by the following Areas?:**

volunteer support	$16,523,600	
volunteer training	269,300	
sponsor training	189,900	
VISTA recruitment,	)	
VISTA communication	) ----	60,000
and public awareness	)	
VISTA evaluation	130,900	

Question: **The FY 86 authorized level of the VISTA program is $25 M. After the Gramm-Rudman 4.3% cut, is it correct that VISTA's budget will be approximately $18.1 M., 28% below the authorized level?**

Answer: Congress appropriated $19.1 million for VISTA for FY 1986. The actual post-sequestration budget for VISTA is $18,183,000 or $18.2 M., which is 27% below the authorized level. As you know, appropriation levels are often below the authorization level.

Question: **In FY 86, what percentage below the authorized level are Part B, Service Learning Programs?**

Answer: At the Gramm-Rudman budget level of $1,309,000, the Service-Learning Programs are 27% below the authorized level of $1,800,000.

Question: **In FY 86, what percentage below the authorized level are Part C, Special Volunteer Program Demonstrations?**

Answer: The revised budget level for the Voluntary Citizen Participation and Volunteer Demonstration Programs is $1,724,000, which is 13% below the authorized level of $1,984,000.

Question: **In FY 86, what percentage below the authorized level are each of the Older American Volunteer Programs?**

Answer: The Retired Senior Volunteer Program's revised funding level of $28,346,000 is 9% below the authorized level of $31,100,00. The Foster Grandparent Program level of $53,688,000 is 9% below its authorized level of $58,700,000. The Gramm-Rudman level for the Senior Companion Progam, $17,308,000, is 39% less than the authorized level of $28,600,000. In total, the 4.3% Gramm-Rudman reductions have put the Older American Programs 16% below the authorized level of $118,400,000; the revised total is $99,342,000.

Question: **In FY 86, what percentage below the authorized level is the Agency support budget?**

Answer: The Agency's program administration allocation of $24,224,000 is 14% below the authorized level of $28,000,000.

Question: **The ACTION portion of the President's FY 87 budget submission states "Funds requested for the VISTA program will support 2220 paid volunteers, the same number supported with 1986 funds (pre-sequestration)." The pre-sequestration level for VISTA in FY 86 as mandated by the D.V.S.A. Amendments of 1984, (P.L. 98-288) and the FY 86 Labor/HHS bill (P.L. 98-178) mandates and provides funding for 2400 volunteer service years, not 2200, and an appropriations of $19 M. for VISTA in FY 86, or does the $19,250,000 figure specified for VISTA also include $1.368,000 for Part B, Service Learning?**

Answer: The Budget Appendix for the President's FY 1987 budget shows $19,258,000 for the VISTA activity, which includes $17,890,000 for the VISTA program and $1,368,000 for the Service-Learning Programs; however, the Appendix does not provide any estimate of VISTA volunteer service years. The VISTA program staff estimates for FY 1987 supporting 2,325 volunteer services years at the requested level.

VISTA's pre-sequestration program plans were to support 2400 volunteer service years in FY 86, a figure which we will attempt to support even with the Gramm-Rudman reductions.

Question: **What are the Administration's requested funding levels for VISTA in FY's 87, 88 and 89?**

Answer: The Administration is requesting funding levels of $17,890,000 for FY 87, and "such sums" for FY's 88 and 89.

Question: **So, in fact, is the President requesting a $1.1 M. reduction in VISTA from the FY 86 pre-sequestration level?**

Answer: Yes, the FY 87 request of $17,890,000 for VISTA represents a reduction of $1,100,000 from the FY 86 pre-sequestration level of $19,000,000.

Question: **If $19 M. in FY 86 was required to support 2400 service years, at the same service year cost as FY 86, how many service years will $17,890,000 support in FY 87?**

Answer: In FY 87, $17,890,000 will support 2,325 volunteer service years.

Question: **In FY 87, at the same service year cost as FY 86, what would it cost to support 2400 volunteer service years?**

Answer: To support 2,400 volunteer services years it would take $18,455,000.

Question: **Is the Administration seeking to eliminate the VISTA funding floor in FYs 87-89? If so why?**

The current authority does not contain a funding floor but does contain a service year level for VISTA. The Administrative proposal merely seeks to restore some degree of flexibility in managing VISTA and other Title I programs.

Question: **Is it correct that a VISTA funding floor has been in the law since the original enactment of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973?**

Answer: FY'73 to FY'83 the authorization language did contain a funding floor. This was eliminated in FY 84-86 and a service year level provision substituted.

Question: **The President's FY 87 budget request for the ACTION Agency is quite generous in view of the way other social programs are being cut. Is it correct that all of the programs of the ACTION Agency, except VISTA, are slated to be restored to their FY 86 levels, prior to the 4.3% cut?**

Answer: Yes.

Question: **If this is the case, why is VISTA, the federal government's only full-time domestic anti-poverty volunteer program, being dealt with more harshly than Parts B and C, which operate no specific program authorized by the Congress?**

Answer: It is the Administration position that the FY 87 budget request for ACTION reflects the best use of taxpayer dollars during this time of legislated fiscal restraint and that $17,890,000 does not, in any way, represent harsh treatment for the VISTA program. The FY'87 budget request is the result of careful review of resources and represents an equitable and reasonable level for all programs administered by ACTION.

Part C funds are authorized by the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, as amended (Pub. L. 93-113, Title I, Part C, 42 U.S.C. 4992). The specific programs are the MiniGrant Program; the State Office of Voluntarism Program, formerly the State Offices of Voluntary Participation Program; the Technical Assistance Program; and the Demonstration Grant Program. These programs afford Action the opportunity to test new and innovative ways of using volunteers to address a wide range of local needs; providing seed monies to initiate volunteer programming in local neighborhoods; developing how-to materials for nationwide distribution; and creating statewide offices to promote voluntarism.

Question: **How can you justify restoring funding to demonstration programs -- programs that are not ongoing, have no track record of effectiveness, and are not necessarily anti-poverty -- at the expense of VISTA, a most cost effective and proven anti-poverty program?**

Answer: It is the Administration's position that the FY '87 budget request reflects the best use of taxpayer dollars and represents an equitable treatment of all programs administered by ACTION.

ACTION's Part C grants have a track record of well-documented effectiveness and their focus is poverty-related. It is important to recognize that Part C grants have a complementary function to VISTA and that successful demonstration grants have contributed to alleviating the poverty cycle and have served as models for several VISTA projects.

In conclusion, ACTION's demonstration grant program functions in some ways as a research and development program and in other ways as a technical assistance program. The demonstration grant program has provided many viable and effective models which have been used by VISTA grantees and staffed with VISTA volunteers. In other words, the demonstration grant program does have a track record of effectiveness by the very fact that it can be and has been replicated by other ACTION grantees.

VISTA Recruitment/Public Awareness

Question: **A. What steps have you taken as the Director of ACTION to ensure that VISTA Volunteer opportunities are not restricted only to those residents living in communities directly served by VISTA sponsoring organizations?**

B. What type of national efforts has ACTION made since the passage of the '84 amendments to nationally recruit VISTA volunteers? How many and what percentage of VISTAs today are nationally recruited?

Answer: Although we have no current shortage of volunteers to fill available slots, we have discussed with field staff and sponsors recruitment needs. As a result we are developing a regional recruitment policy to deal with recruitment on an inter-state/intra-regional basis. From discussions with field staff and sponsors, we also hope to provide each region a small fund to cover intra-regional volunteer relocation expenses.

As part of an overall marketing strategy for ACTION, a national publicity campaign has resulted in countless positive news clippings for VISTA. In addition, we have issued a widely acclaimed new VISTA poster, released a how to fundraising booklet and, in general, kept VISTA in the media forefront.

Furthermore, during FY 86 the VISTA staff and ACTION's Computer Services office will be working to develop the feasibility of a national clearinghouse and waiting list. At this time, state and regional ACTION offices maintain files of applications from those interested in VISTA service. These are provided to sponsors as they begin the recruiting process.

C. If a potential volunteer calls ACTION in Washington and is willing to volunteer wherever his or her particular skills are needed, is that applicant informed of volunteer opportunities nationwide or is he or she referred only to the ACTION state office in the state in which he or she resides?

Answer: The types of available VISTA activities are discussed with the potential volunteer caller. The caller is advised to contact the ACTION State Office which serves his/her state for opportunities available in the area where he/she lives or is interested in serving.

D. **Does VISTA have an 800 number? If so, why isn't it listed on the VISTA poster ACTION recently produced?**

Answer: The VISTA toll free number located in Washington, D.C., is (800) 424-8867 or 8868. The number is not listed on the VISTA poster because callers would be referred to the ACTION office in his/her state. Also, the VISTA brochure was produced in conjunction with the poster and instructs potential volunteers to call the ACTION State Office which services their area of interest.

E. **It's often been said that a picture is worth a thousand words. The new and only VISTA poster currently in circulation is a rear view of a young man in jeans and an undershirt carrying a jean jacket with a VISTA patch. The ad seems more appropriate for selling Calvin Klein jeans than encouraging anti-poverty service. What message is the poster intended to convey? How does it convey the message that VISTA is an anti-poverty volunteer program targeted to addressing poverty and poverty-related problems? What segment of the population is the poster intended to appeal to?**

It is stated on the poster that VISTA is a commitment to "help the poor in your community." The intent of the poster is to encourage young adults to volunteer their service to America.

The VISTA poster was designed to appeal to all Americans willing to roll up their sleeves to help their neighbors in need; however, in the choice of the visual and headline there is an attempt to target the 18-40 age group.

The headline, "Serve in the U.S.A." is meant to appeal to the resurgence of patriotism in the country. The sub-head, "The Adventure Begins at Home," was selected because it is believed to be very competitive with other programs seeking to tap the generosity of Americans wanting to address the problems of poverty in their communities. Body copy clearly describes, in a minimum of words, the program's focus..."Make a full-time, one-year commitment to helping the poor in your community."

Like posters produced by ACTION for its other programs and those on the subject of voluntarism generally, the VISTA poster is designed to capture a viewer's attention and to encourage further inquiry that will lead to information on VISTA that goes into much greater detail and a more personal recruiting message. A flyer, produced in conjunction with and sharing the same cover graphics as this poster, contains over 2,000 words describing VISTA and its activities and backgrounds of its volunteers.

Question: **On reviewing the new VISTA brochure recently issued by ACTION, it is clear that all of the emphasis is on serving exclusively in your community. Why is there no indication that this is a national anti-poverty volunteer program and service is not restricted to one's home community?**

Answer: We believe that the brochure along with other forms of publicity for the VISTA program portrays VISTA as a national program.

One of my goals for VISTA is to increase its profile in the volunteer community. The Agency recently took steps to ensure that people from all walks of life know that volunteer opportunities are available to them through ACTION.

We are producing four VISTA radio Public Service Announcements. These PSA's will be completed during this quarter and will be distributed to over 10,000 radio stations nation-wide.

We produced three new technical assistance manuals - one for publicity, one for fund-raising and planning, and one for recruitment. These were specifically designed to assist VISTA sponsors in effectively carrying out their work. Local sponsors will be able to use these guides to garner local publicity and resources in support of their VISTA volunteers.

Question: **We understand that the average age of a VISTA today is close to 40 years old. Is this correct?**

The median age of VISTA Volunteers is 36.

Question: **What efforts do you plan to undertake in FYs 87-89 to recruit younger people into the program?**

Answer: The VISTA poster is part of the process being used to recruit younger people into the program. ACTION State Offices and VISTA sponsors recruit at schools, campuses, and other places where younger people frequent, as necessary. In addition, assistance is provided to VISTA sponsors in structuring volunteer assignments which appeal to younger people.

Question: **Recently over 100 college and university presidents have joined together in the Project for Community and Public Service to encourage voluntary and community service among college students. These campuses seem to be ripe ground from which to recruit VISTA volunteers. What are your plans for college campus recruitment in FYs 87-89?**

We have recently produced a new VISTA technical Assistance brochure and have instructed our Regional Direcorts to step up local recruitment on college campuses.

In addition, we have initiated discussions with Peace Corps about possible joint recruitment on college capmuses.

ACTION State Offices and VISTA sponsors will continue and expand their current college campus recruitment activities.

Question: **Ms. Alvarado, as you travel and see and meet with VISTA volunteers do you sense that the volunteers feel a part of VISTA - a 2,500 person volunteer corps -- or is their affiliation primarily with the sponsoring organization to which they are assigned?**

Because the majority of VISTA Volunteers are locally recruited, it is natural that their immediate identification is with the organization to which they are assigned. However, they do have an understanding of VISTA, its importance, and their contribution to the VISTA program goals.

Question: **Do you feel that they should feel a sense of identity with the VISTA program and other VISTA volunteers and projects at the local, state and national levels?**

Answer: Yes I do. We will be taking steps in volunteer training sessions in FY '87 to ensure that a stronger sense of identity is instilled.

Project Coordination

Question: **What type of networking and information sharing exists among VISTA projects working throughout the country in the same issue area such as illiteracy, hunger or unemployment?**

Answer: Networking and information sharing in the same issue area are done regionally among projects and volunteers at statewide or Regional training sessions. In instances where a national organization, e.g., Literacy Volunteers of America, has VISTAs serving with its affiliates throughout the country, the national organization often fosters networking through a newsletter, conferences, or exchanges of general technical assistance material.

Question: **Are VISTA projects and volunteers in a specific state aware of all the other projects and volunteers in that state?**

Answer: Projects and volunteers are made aware of other state projects and volunteers through Regional and/or state-wide conferences and training sessions.

Question: **Is there any joint training -- pre-service or in-service -- for all the VISTAs in each state?**

Answer: Yes, and as the budget permits, we are looking for additional ways of providing pre-service or in-service training for VISTAs on a statewide basis.

VISTA Profile Data

Question: **Currently, how many VISTA volunteers are there?**

Answer: As of 12/31/85, there were 2,656 VISTA Volunteers on board.

Question: **How many VISTA projects are now operating?**

Answer: As of 12/31/85, there were 554 VISTA projects.

Question: **At the end of FY 85 how many VISTA volunteers were there?**

Answer: There were 2,602 VISTA volunteers at the end of FY'85.

Question: **How many VISTA projects?**

Answer: There were 534 VISTA projects at the end of FY'85.

Question: **How many training entries were there in FY 85?**

Answer: There were 2440 training entries in FY'85.

Question: **In FY 85 were VISTA volunteers placed evenly throughout the fiscal year?**

Answer: In FY '85, 468 VISTA Volunteers were placed in the First Quarter, 525 in the Second, 757 in the Third, and 690 in the Fourth. (Total for FY '85 is 2,440.)

Question: **How many volunteer service years will you support in FY 86?**

Answer: In FY '86 we expect to support 2,400 volunteer service years.

Question: **What will be the end year strength at the conclusion of FY 86?**

Answer: At the end of FY '86 we anticipate that there will be approximately 1700 volunteers in the field.

Question: **What will be the end year strength at the conclusion of FY '87?**

Answer: Although it is difficult to predict the exact number of people who will be serving as volunteers on September 30, 1987, we would anticipate approximately 2300 people will be serving as VISTA volunteers on that date.

Question: **How many VISTA projects will be operating at the end of FY '86?**

Answer: We expect that approximately 375 VISTA projects will be operating at the end of FY '86.

Question: **In FY '85 what was the service year cost?**

The Service year cost for FY '85 was approximately $7,862.

Question: **In FY '86 what will be the service year cost?**

Answer: The service year cost for FY '86 is approximately $7,522.

Question: **What do you intend it to be for FYs 87, 88, 89?**

Answer: The service year cost for FY '87 is expected to be $7,640. We have no cost projections for FY '88 and FY '89.

Question: **What is the profile of the average VISTA today -- specifically? What percentage are women? What percentage are men? What percentage are, themselves, low income? What percentage are minorities? What percentage have a college or advance degree? What percentage have less than 2 years of a college education?**

Answer: As of 9/30/85, 25% of the VISTA volunteers were male, and 75% were female. The racial breakdown of volunteers are as follows:

Black	22%
Hispanic	16%
Native Americans	3%
Asian	5%
Caucasian	54%

We do not have current statistics on the number of low-income volunteers, or the education level of volunteers.

Question: **How does the average age, economic level and education level of a VISTA compare to 1970? To 1978? To 1980?**

	FY '70	FY '78	FY '80
Median Age	N/A	27	29
Education Level			
College or advance degree	N/A	51%	45%
Less than 2 yrs. college	N/A	49%	55%

Question: The D.V.S.A. Amendments of 1984, P.L. 98-288 require that 20% of all VISTAs be persons 55 years of age or older. Currently how many and **what percentage of VISTAs are 55 years or older?**

Answer: As of 9/30/85, 480 volunteers, 18.1%, were age 55 years or older.

Follow-up to 1984 Amendments

Question: Sec. 501(d) (1) (B) of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act Amendments of 1984 (P.L. 98-288) mandated that in FY 84 there first be available for Part A of Title I (VISTA) an amount not less than the amount required to support 2,200 volunteer service years. On February 6th, 1986 the Director of ACTION testified before this committee (page 11 of her testimony) that "in fiscal year 1985, VISTA contributed 2,035 volunteer service years to more than 500 communities." Are **these figures correct? If so, why didn't ACTION comply with the 2,200 volunteer service year floor level required under the law?**

Answer: The figure cited is not correct. In FY 85, VISTA produced 2023 standard service years and 179 grant service years to produce a total of 2202 volunteer service years.

The D.V.S.A. Amendments of 1984 emphasized the assignment of VISTA Volunteers to projects that address the problem of the homeless, the jobless, the hungry, illiterate or functionally illiterate youth and other individuals and low income youth, alcohol and drug abuse prevention.

Question: **How many VISTA volunteers are working in each of these areas? How many VISTA projects are addressing each of these issues?**

Answer: The following chart reflects the number of volunteers and projects working in the above issue areas as of 12/31/85.

	Projects	Volunteers
Homeless	72	330
Employment	116	593
Hunger	128	554
Literacy	112	640
Alcohol/drug Abuse Prevention	78	464

Question: **How many Part B service learning projects are addressing each of these areas?**

Answer: The following chart reflects the percent of Young Volunteers In ACTION (YVA) projects working in these issue areas as of 9/30/85.

Homeless	20%
Employment (youth)	20%
Hunger	23%
Literacy	76%
Alcohol/Drug Abuse Prevention	20%

Question: **How many Part C demonstration projets are addressing each of these areas?**

Answer: The following list reflects the number of Part C demonstration projects (for FY 1985 and FY 1986 up through 2/86) addressing specific issue areas:

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention		13
Employment		5
Homeless		3
Literacy		3
Hunger		2
<u>Other Categories</u>		
Youth Related:		14
Child Abuse	(2)	
Latchkey	(4)	
Adoption	(1)	
Youth Support Services	(7)	

We will soon publish a Request for Proposals in the Federal Register which will include the following focus areas: literacy and employment training for youth, runaway youth, refugee assistance, independent living for foster care graduates, assistance to farm families in crisis and drug use and prevention.

In addition, ACTION Regional Directors have been intstructed to seek out innovative proposals at the State and Regional level.

Question: Please describe the type of pre-service and in-service training provided by ACTION to the typical VISTA volunteer.

Answer: All new volunteers are required to participate in a one-to-two day Pre-Service Orientation (PSO) at time of placement, or in an early service training event which will occur no later than six weeks after initial placement. These events are conducted by ACTION staff and will cover, at minimum, the following topics:

.mission of the VISTA program;
.programs and goals of the ACTION Agency;
.role of the VISTA volunteer;
.legal and administrative guidelines relating to VISTA Volunteers and sponsors;
.terms and conditions and benefits of VISTA service, including allowance structure, and health benefits policy and procedures;
.volunteer and sponsor mobilization of private sector resources as related to enhancement and institutionalization of project activities;
.introduction to sponsoring organization and volunteer and project work plans.

Also, Sponsors initiate On-the Job Orientation (OJO) immediately after volunteers report to the project site. State staff review and approve sponsor-developed (OJO) plans to ensure that they cover at minimum:

.background, organization and overall purpose of the sponsoring organization;
.background of the community and identification of community leaders;
.nature of the low-income population served by the VISTA project;
.potential resources (funds, materials, people) can be applied to achieve project goals;
.supervisory and support structure for the volunteers;
.clarification of individual volunteer work plans and how volunteer progress in achieving work plan objectives will be assessed;

In-service training for volunteers stress skills requirements needed to perform individual assignments, private sector resource mobilization, technical assistance in specific program areas, linkages with private sector and other organizations involved in similar activities, and techniques in recruiting community volunteers. In some instances, VISTA volunteers participate in workshops conducted by the National Center for Service Learning. In-service training funds can also be used to support such items as: ACTION-sponsored training events, attendance at workshops, conferences, etc., courses or seminars at educational institutions, travel costs to similar projects, or training materials. Consultants may be hired on a limited basis with prior concurrence by the Director of VISTA.

Question: **How many hours of training does a volunteer receive and when and where is the training conducted?**

Answer: VISTA Volunteers receive 1-2 days of pre-service orientation conducted by ACTION prior to project assignment, and in-service training which varies in length depending on the needs of the project and the specific assignment of the volunteer. ACTION and/or the project sponsor conducts or arranges for in-service training. The locations of various training events are determined by ACTION State Office.

Question: **What percentage of the training is provided by ACTION and what percentage is provided by the sponsoring organization?**

Answer: ACTION provides all volunteer pre-service orientation, VISTA supervisory training, and a significant portion of volunteer in-service training. The project sponsor provides on-job orientation to the volunteers immediately after assignment and on-going skills training as needed by volunteers during service.

Question: **What standards does ACTION use to evaluate the training VISTA volunteers receive?**

Answer: ACTION State Directors approve all types of volunteer training based on the objectives described in the response to the question on the type of pre-service and in-service training, two questions above. This includes plans for low-income volunteer career development as well.

Question: **In FY 86, how much did you spend on pre-service and in-service training for VISTA volunteers?**

Answer: In FY '86 VISTA plans to spend $87,000 on volunteer pre-service orientation and $181,400 on volunteer in-service training. Additionally, the agency is spending $400,000 on SCSL training attended by VISTA sponsors and volunteers.

Question: **How does this compare to FY 80? To FY 78?**

Answer: In FY 80, with 3,982 VISTA service years, $1,182,000 was spent on volunteer pre-service training, and $684,000 was spent on volunteer in-service training. Figures for FY 78 are not available.

Question: **How much do you intend to spend in each of the fiscal years 87, 88, and 89 for pre-service and in-service training?**

Answer: In FY 87, we expect to spend approximately $88,000 on volunteer pre-service training, $181,000 on volunteer in-service training, and $190,000 on VISTA supervisory training. No figures are available for FY 88 and FY 89. Additionally SCSL training is available to sponsors and volunteers.

Question: **In FY 85 how much did VISTA spend for VISTA supervisory and transportation grants?**

Answer: In FY '85 VISTA spent a combined total of $600,000 for VISTA supervision and volunteer on-job transportation support. In FY 85, 2,200 volunteer service years were produced.

Question: **How does this compare to the FY 80?**

Answer: In FY 80, a total of $3,259,000 was spent on VISTA supervision and transportation support for a total of 3,982 volunteer service years.

Question: **What percentage of VISTA projects received supervision and transportation grants?**

As of 12/31/85 of 554 VISTA projects 29% were receiving supervision grants, and 48% were receiving transportation grants.

Question: **What is the average VISTA supervisor grant?**

Answer: The average VISTA supervision grant is $10,777.

Question: **What is the average VISTA transportation grant?**

Answer: The average VISTA transportation grant is $2,751.

Question; **How many projects receive 100% or more in excess of the average grants awarded for supervision and transportation?**

Eleven (11) projects receive 100% or more in supervision grants.

Twenty nine (29) projects receive 100% or more in transportation grants.

-19-

Question: Please provide a list identifying each of these projects and the amounts of the awards?

VISTA Supervision Grants

1-	New York VVLP New York, New York	$30,400
2-	Alabama Dept. of Mental Health Montgomery, Alabama	24,804
3-	N.C. Against Drug Alcohol Abuse Raleigh, North Carolina	21,000
4-	N.C. Commission on Indian Affairs Raleigh, North Carolina	21,316
5-	Big Brothers/Big Sisters Texas Austin, Texas	23,193
6-	Good Samaritan of Garland Garland, Texas	24,643
7-	Comm. Action Program-West Teach the Child San Antonio, Texas	29,269
8-	Freemont Public Association Seattle, Washington	22,046
9-	Literacy Volunteers of Connecticut Enfield, Connecticut	23,273
10-	Mass. Assoc. of Older Americans Boston, Massachusetts	24,824
11-	Birthright of Boston Boston, Massusetts	22,175

VISTA Transportation Grants

1-	New York VVLP New York, NY	$12,000
2-	Kentucky River Community Care Jackson, KY	6,400
3-	Parents Anonymous of Kentucky Lexington, KY	7,650
4-	Blue Ridge Area Food Bank Staunton, VA	6,625
5-	Federation of Southern Coop. Epes, Alabama	10,808
6-	Bay Area Food Bank Mobile, AL	5,505
7-	Alabama Dept. of Mental Health Montgomery, AL	10,656
8-	Daily Bread Community Food Bank Miami, FL	8,316
9-	Florida Informed Parents Tallahasee, FL	9,540
10-	Washington Issaquena Comm. Greenville, MS	5,610
11-	Family Service Association Jackson, MS	5,712
12-	NC Literacy Association Laurinburg, NC	10,320
13-	North Carolinians Against Drug Alcohol Abuse Raleigh, NC	7,650
14-	NC Commission on Indian Affairs Raleigh, NC	11,016

15-	SC Literacy Association Columbia, SC	$ 9,792
16-	SC State Library Columbia, SC	7,990
17-	Literacy Miss. Vols Jackson, TN	6,728
18-	Syracuse Area Interreligous Council Syracuse, NY	7,000
19-	Spanish Coalition for Vols Jobs Chicago, IL	7,200
20-	Coalition of Wisconsin Aging Groups Madison, WI	7,344
21-	Nun Kitlutsisti Bethel, AK	6,000
22-	Latin Chamber of Commerce Miami, FL	6,912
23-	Youth & Shelter Services Ames, IA	6,545
24-	Creston District Council of Ministries Creston, IA	9,679
25-	Michigan Network of Runaway & Youth Services Lansing, MI	5,508
26-	Minnesota Literacy Council St. Paul, MN	7,266
27-	Southern Development Foundation Lafayette, LA	8,091
28-	Coalition of Texans with Disabilities Austin, TX	5,725
29-	Office of Youth Affairs San Juan, PR	5,617

The D.V.S.A. Amendments of 1984 required the Director to provide each low-income community volunteer with an individual career development plan for job advancement or to a situation leading to gainful employment.

Question: Is ACTION in compliance with this provision of the law?

Answer: Sponsors, with assistance from State Offices, determine eligibility for career development assistance utilizing the 1985 Poverty Income Guidelines. Individual plans are developed by the project sponsor in conjunction with the State Office utilizing "Career-Life Planning--A Workbook for Volunteers" and Career-Life Planning--A Manual for Trainers." The individual plans include career goals and career information, counseling and other career/job planning activities. Sponsors are encouraged to use local resources in these efforts in coordination with Private Industry Council serving their area.

Question: To what extent has ACTION coordinated career development efforts for low income volunteers with Private Industry Councils, as encouraged under the law?

Answer: Sponsors are directed to contact the local Private Industry Council serving their area to coordinate career development efforts for low-income volunteers.

The 1984 Amendments to the D.V.S.A. added an additional objective to VISTA's statement of purpose: The generation and commitment to private sector resources and the encouragement of volunteer service at the local level.

Historically VISTA has an impressive track record in each of these areas. A 1979 survey indicated that each VISTA mobilized on the average $24,000 in financial resources for his or her project and generated nearly a dozen full-time and part-time community volunteers.

Question: **Do you feel that VISTA volunteers today are effectively mobilizing and generating volunteer and financial support for the VISTA projects to which they are assigned?**

Answer: Yes, VISTSA volunteers are effective in mobilizing resources from the community. All VISTA projects are required, as a condition of their approval and renewal, to demonstrate that they will mobilize financial and other resources and recruit volunteers from the community to assist in institutionalization of VISTA activities after the Federal resource is withdrawn. In addition, VISTA supervisors are participating in National Center for Service Learning Conferences which focus on private sector fund-raising and volunteer recruitment.

Data on the generation of communnity financial support will be evaluated in the VISTA evaluation to be conducted in FY 86 and FY 87.

Question: **What evaluations or studies do you have verifying compliance with this provision of the law?**

Answer: In FY '85, VISTA awarded an evaluation contract to design an instrument to measure VISTA Goal Accomplishments and Community Effects. The instrument will be used to evaluate a sample of second-year projects in FY '86 and to re-evaluate those same projects in FY '87 to determine their effectiveness in institutionalizing VISTA activities. The cost, over a three year period, (FY 85-87) will be approximately $300,000.

SERVICE LEARNING

Question: **To date in FY 86, how much have you spent on Part B Service Learning Programs?**

Answer: As of February 1986, ACTION has obligated $49,521 in Part B fund.

Question: What percentage of the Part B budget is uncommitted at this time?

Question: $1,368,000 was appropriated for Part B of which $59,000 was sequestered by Gramm-Rudman leaving a balance of $1,309,000. Of that total, $49,521 has been obligated to date leaving $1,259,479 in the Part B budget for the remainder of the year. We are currently revising our student Service-Learning program guidelines, which will be published in the Federal Register for public comment. Final publication of the guidelines, they will be used to solicit new proposals for Part B.

Answer: **Please provide a list of all Part B grants awarded in FY 86 and indicate if they are new or renewal grants and the amount of the grant?**

1-High School - Big Brothers/Big Sisters (renewals)

Yonkers, New York	$16,106
Somerset, New Jersey	$15,738

2-Young Volunteers in ACTION (YVA) - Wesley Community Center (renewal)

Wesley Community Center Houston, Texas	$17,677

Question: **The FY 86 Budget submission indicates that 45 Young Volunteers in ACTION projects would be funded, costing approximately $1.1 M. Is this still your intention? If not, how will the $1.1 M. be spent?**

Answer: Of the $1.2 million currently remaining in the Part B budget, approximately $400,000 will be used to fund Young Volunteers in ACTION and Big Brothers/Big Sisters renewal grants. The remainder will be used to fund new student service-learning grants according to the following proposed guidelines.

a) Emphasis on service-learning, the low-income population, community relations awareness, mobilizing community resources, and project self-sufficiency.

b) Maximum grants are up to $15,000. Grant renewals for a second year are up to $10,000, and up to $5,000 for year three. In each year, grantees will be required to provide a local match of at least $3,000.

c) Measurable and quantifiable goals and objectivies to include the number of active volunteers who will participate in the project, and the volunteer hours to be generated.

d) Students be enrolled in secondary, secondary vocational or post-secondary schools.

Question: In FY 86, how much will be spent on the Service-Learning (NCSL) contract?

Answer: The new guidelines described above will be used to distribute the remaining Part B monies. The status of the NCSL contract is currently under review. A decision on its renewal will be made early in the third quarter.

Question: What are ACTION's plans in Fiscal years 87, 88, and 89 for the awarding of Part B. grants and contracts?

Answer: Same as above

Part C Grants

Question: Please provide for the record a list of all Part C grants and award amounts in Fiscal years 84, 85, and 86? Please indicate the purpose the award?

Answer: See attachment A.

Question: What percentage of Part C funds have been expended to date?

Answer: 5% of Part C funds have been obligated.

Question: How many of the grantees are new?

Answer: Two new demonstration grants were awarded during the first quarter of 1986, one to the American Council on Drug Education and the other to Lutheran Social Services whose first year of funding was provided through interagency agreement with the Department of State.

Question: **How many are renewable?**

Answer: One grant has been renewed during the first quarter of Fiscal Year 1986, Bid Resource Center.

Question: **How many of the awards were in excess of $50,000?**

Answer: No demonstration grants for more than $50,000 were awarded in the first quarter of FY 1986.

Question: **Since FY 81 have any organizations received demonstration grants for more than 3 years? If so, please provide a listing and the amounts provided by fiscal year?**

Answer: Yes, four organizations have been funded for more than three years, Georgia State University, Parents Resources and Information for Drug Education (PRIDE); Covenant House, a youth runaway shelter; Save Cambodia, Inc., a refugee assistance program; and Families In Action, a national drug abuse prevention project. The following is a listing by fiscal year for each grantee:

PRIDE	FY 82	$235,462
	83	183,253
	84	263,362
	85	317,368
Covenant House	FY 82	$124,443
	83	34,939
	84	88,418
	85	174,966
Families in Action	FY 82	$ 43,920
	83	31,330
	84	58,959
	85	18,618
Save Cambodia, Inc.	FY 81	$115,746
	82	81,865
	83	50,000
	84	102,316

Question: Have all grants awarded since the enactment of the D.V.S.A. 84 amendment (P.L. 98-288), in excess of $50,000 been awarded competitively including public announcement of the availability of the funds, criteria and description of the application and review process?

Answer: Since the enactment of D.V.S.A. 84 amendment (P.L. 98-288), all grants over $50,000 have been awarded competitively by public announcement of the availability of funds, criteria and description of the application and review process.

Question: Please provide a listing of all Part C grants awarded through a competitive process since enactment of the 1984 amendments, specify name and amount by fiscal year?

Answer: Since the 1984 Amendment requiring competition of all grants over $50,000, there have been three grants over $50,000 awarded competitively. They are:

- Harlingen Information and Social Services Organization (HISSO)
  Harlingen, Texas
  $52,684 9/29/84

  Project is operating a community focal point center through the recruitment and use of volunteers to operate a congregate feeding service, provide arts and crafts activities, offer periodical health screening, give information and referral, provide transportation, and operate an emergency shelter and a food pantry.

- Georgia State University (PRIDE)
  Atlanta, Georgia
  $299,962 3/21/85

  Project is establishing a long-term residential and job training program for runaway and older homeless youth at its runaway shelter.

Project is operating a National Family Resource Center that supports voluntary parent groups through the provision of information and the operation of a toll-free telephone number to assist these groups to prevent drug use among youth. Project also conducts an annual international conference for parents and youth to share ideas and model programs preventing drug use. Last year's conference was attended by 17 First Ladies from around the world hosted by Nancy Reagan.

-Covenant House, New York
New York, New York
$75,000 3/27/85

Question: **What are ACTION's plans in fiscal years 87, 88, and 89 for the awarding of Part C grants and contracts?**

Answer: In order to maximize the limited amount of ACTION discretionary funds, it is important to maintain flexibility in determining how these monies will be spent for fiscal years 1987, '88 and '89. ACTION's limited discretionary funds can best be used in testing new theories regarding voluntarism, in developing innovative ways to use volunteers, and in helping to replicate nationwide the objectives and achievements of these successful demonstration projects.

ACTION is committed to continuing efforts to help break the poverty cycle through these projects. For instance, ACTION is exploring new initiatives in using volunteers to help provide independent living skills and job search and employment skills to graduates of foster care homes.

Finally ACTION plans to work closely with other federal agencies both through interagency agreements and the sharing of information on successful projects.

Title IV Related Questions -- Administration and Coordination

Question: The D.V.S.A. 1984 Amendments require the Director to biennially measure and evaluate the impact of all programs authorized by the Act. When was the last impact evaluation of the VISTA program conducted?

Answer: ACTION's Evaluation Division is currently preparing an evaluation of VISTA's goal accomplishment and the effects on the communities in which VISTA is serving. This evaluation will measure the following:

- success with the institutionalization of VISTA efforts,
- the mobilization of local resources by VISTA volunteers,
- accomplishment of specific project objectives,
- the extent to which VISTA efforts have benefitted low-income recipients and communities, and
- factors which affect accomplishment of the above.

A contract was let in September 1985 to design the evaluation. The design of this evaluation will be completed by April 1986, and the first round of data collection will begin in September 1986. The second and final round of data collection will begin one year later in September 1987. The final report will be ready for release in May 1988.

There has never been an impact evaluation of VISTA until this evaluation. The last evaluation of VISTA before this one was the 1980 VISTA Activities Survey that was completed in 1981.

-30-

Question: **How much did ACTION spend in each of the FYs 84, 85, and 86 on VISTA evaluations? How much do you intend to spend in FYs 87, 88, and 89?**

Answer: ACTION records show the following amounts spent and planned for VISTA evaluations.

FY 1984	$ 0
FY 1985	49,600
FY 1986	130,897
FY 1987	126,766
FY 1988	2,000
FY 1989	0

Section 407 of the D.V.S.A. required full and complete annual reports to the Congress on the activities of the ACTION Agency in each fiscal year as well as the findings and actions taken as a result of the biennially evaluations.

Question: **Has ACTION provided such reports to the Congress in FYs 84, 85, and 86? When was the last such report provided?**

Answer: Yes. ACTION's FY 1984 Annual Report was delivered to the President, The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House in accordance with Public Law 93-113, Section 407, as amended. The final draft of the FY 1985 report was submitted to the President's Office of Management and Budget on January 16, 1986. Type-setting has been completed and the printed version will be distributed shortly. The Annual Report for FY 1986 will be delivered to the President in January of 1987, as required by law.

The FY 1984 evaluation report has been submitted to the Congress. The FY 1985 evaluation report is currently being prepared for printing.

In addition, two copies of all evaluation reports are routinely provided to the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress upon completion. These reports include the evaluation's findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Question: **The D.V.S.A. Amendments upgraded from Associate Directorships to Assistant Directors the OAVP Director and the VISTA Director. Was the intent of Congress that these positions be the 4th and 5th most senior position in the Agency, following the ACTION Director, Deputy Director and Associate Director for Domestic and Anti-poverty Operations. Is this the case under the current Agency organization?**

Answer: Under current Agency organization, these officials represent the senior levels of management responsible for program and policy development.

Question: **Please provide for the record a biographical sketch of the individuals currently serving as the VISTA Director and the OAVP Director?**

Answer: See attachment B.

Question: **The D.V.S.A. 84 Amendments placed a cap of 8.5% on certain categories of non-career employees - experts, consultants, Schedule C's, temporaries above grade 8?**

Question: **Currently what percentage of employees are in these categories?**

Answer: Currently 4.7% of ACTION's employees fall within the restricted categories.

Question: **How many Schedule B's are currently employed by ACTION?**

Answer: At the present time 10 ACTION employees have been hired under the Schedule B authority.

Notice and Hearing Procedures

Question: **When did ACTION issue final regulations relating to P.L. 98-288's Sec. 412 amendments -- Notice and Hearing procedures for Suspension and Termination of Financial Assistance?**

Answer: Action issued final regulations relating to P.L. 98-288 amendments to section 412 of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, as amended (specifically Subpart B - Denial of Application for Refunding). The regulations became final on December 2, 1985, 45 days after final publication (in accordance with section 420 of the DVSA).

ACTION Advisory Council

Effective January 1, 1986, the D.V.S.A. 1984 amendments eliminated the ACTION Advisory Council, authorized under Section 405 of the Act. Both the House and Senate versions of the bills had proposed the elimination of the Council noting that the Council's contribution was not sufficiently significant to warrent its continuation.

Question: **In late January 1986, ACTION established the National Volunteer Advisory Council under the authority of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Why did the Agency recreate a Council the Congress quite specifically and intentionally eliminated?**

Answer: The Federal Advisory Committee Act allows agencies to create an Advisory Council with the concurrance of the Office of Management and Budget and the General Services Administration. The intent to create the Council was published in the Federal Register in January, 1986. The Federal Register notice says the Council will advise and make recommendations to the Director in regard to policy matters arising in the Administration of the D.V.S.A. as amended and as to the effectiveness of ACTION programs.

The ACTION Agency established the National Volunteer Advisory Council because the Council significantly contributes to the Agency's ability to accomplish its mission and does so at a minimum cost to the Agency.

The major contributions of the Council include selecting the President's Volunteer ACTION Award recipients and garnering local community support for volunteerism.

Question: **Who is responsible for appointing the members of this Council?**

Answer: The Director appoints Council members.

Question: **Has the Council been appointed? If so, please provide a list of the Council membership and a brief biographical sketch of each of the members of the Council?**

Answer: The Council has been appointed. A membership list and is enclosed.

Question: **Will the Council include any or all of the members who served on the Advisory Council that Congress eliminated?**

Answer: The Council includes members from the previous Advisory Council.

Question: **Does ACTION plan to financially reimburse in any manner the members of the committee for their time, travel or other services?**

Answer: ACTION will comply with the Federal Advisory Committee Act in the matter of reimbursement for travel and expenses.

Question: **Are ACTION employees going to staff this Council?**

Answer: It is anticipated that staff time for the Council will be minimal. However, the Charter (Article 8) does provide for the services of an ACTION staff person for one-half an employee year, if necessary.

Question: **Why doesn't the Council (as described in the Federal Register) include representatives of ACTION volunteer programs, program beneficiaries and actual ACTION Volunteers?**

Answer: The Advisory Council membership is chosen from all areas of the country and from a broad cross section of industry, labor, local, state and Federal government and non-profit organizations. We will continue to insure a "balanced membership" as required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act and as specified in the Federal Register.

Question: **Do you intend this Council to have any functions aside from those advisory in nature?**

Answer: The Federal Advisory Committee Act is very explicit as to the purpose of the Council, and that is to advise. The Council will continue to operate under the guidelines as established in the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Question: **Do you intend to use the Council to solicit contributions from other government entities, non-profits, foundations corporations or individuals?**

Answer: The Federal Advisory Committee Act prohibits activities other than advising. The solicitation of funds is not authorized without statutory authority or a Presidential directive allowing such activity. Section 404(c) of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, as amended, allows the Director to accept contributions but our law does not allow for solicitation, and Council members are not authorized to fundraise.

Question: **How often will this Council meet?**

Answer: Not more than 4 times a year.

Question: **Is there a date for the first meeting?**

Answer: March 5, 1986, in Washington, D.C.

Question: **Will all the meetings of the Council be open to the public?**

Answer: Consistent with the Federal Advisory Committee Act all meetings will be open to the public except when the Director determines closure is warrented under the provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Question: **Why are you seeking new legislative authority to recreate in law what you have already recreated, despite Congress' clearly expressed intent on this matter?**

Answer: The Agency seeks to reinstate legislative authority for the National Volunteer Advisory Council because the opportunity to serve the President enables this Agency to attract persons in positions which provide a calibre of individuals and resources which greatly benefit this Agency. Council members, because of their community and national standing, have given the ACTION Agency more of an opportunity to garner community and private sector support which facilitate our efforts to stimulate and motivate volunteerism.

Question: **Do you intend the National Voluntary Advisory Council you are seeking legislative authority to establish to serve the same purpose and include the same membership as the Council you established outside the authority of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act?**

Answer: The Federal Advisory Committee Act specifies the purpose of an Advisory Council. The ACTION Agency will abide by the law and continue to utilize the National Volunteer Advisory Council in the manner described by the governing law. If enacted, the Council would be appointed by the President. Under those circumstances the membership would most likely change periodically. However, the Agency is not seeking to install any particular individual; the purpose is to create an Advisory Council whose membership would serve at the pleasure of the President.

Question: **In each of the Fys 81, 82, 83, 84, and 85, how much was spent to support the Council?**

Answer: Research as to cost for the year of 1981 is in progress.

In FY 82 $ 2,735.90 (1 meeting)
83 $ 8,128.70 (3 meetings)
84 $ 8,113.41 (3 meetings)
85 $18,334.01 (4 meetings)

Question: In each of the years how many times did they meet?

In FY 82 1 meeting
83 3 meetings
84 3 meetings
85 4 meetings

Question: Please provide the committee with copies of each annual report its findings and recommendations as required under Sec 405 (c) of the Act and any additional information indicating how the Council advised the Director on policy matters?

Answer: In the past, minutes and informal reports have been kept of the Advisory Council meetings, see attachment C. The first Advisory Council meeting called under my direction occurred at the beginning of FY 86, minutes attached. (See attachment C). If Congress reauthorizes the Advisory Council, ACTION will comply with any annual report requirements in the law.

As a direct result of the October, 1985 meeting, Council provided contacts with a number of promotional organizations interested in providing pro bono public awareness services for ACTION and its programs.

Public Awareness Efforts

Question: In FY 86 how much will ACTION spend on public awareness efforts and materials for VISTA?

Answer: To date, $34,500 has been obligated for recruiting and awareness materials for VISTA. Additional obligations of $52,400 are planned during the remainder of this fiscal year, bringing the expected FY 86 total to $86,900.

Question: **How much will be spent to promote the ACTION Agency?**

Answer: A sum of $38,500 has been earmarked for duplicating and distributing a broadcast public service advertising campaign in FY 1986. The theme of the announcements will be one of hope and will feature ACTION programs and volunteers in testimonials to the worth of giving one's time and talents to the community and the nation.

These public service announcements will be excerpted from a feature of approximately 14-16 minutes in length. ACTION does not currently have resources to produce such a feature, but is very optimistic that it will be filmed later in the year through contributions by the private sector.

Other ACTION multi-program promotional activity includes a kit currently being developed for use by volunteer projects in attracting greater support from private and public sources in their own communities. Expected cost of producing and printing this item is $17,000. The public affairs budget, assuming the feature is completed this year, will total $55,000 for materials not specifically aimed at audiences of individual programs but rather at enlarging the opportunities for all to serve.

Question: **Please provide a breakdown by program of communications, publicity, public awareness expenses for all ACTION programs in FY 86?**

Answer: Estimated full-year expenditures for communications, publicity and public awareness activities and materials:

ACTION, Multi-program	$55.5
VISTA	86.9
NCSL	.4
Volunteer Initiatves	35.9
RSVP	58.4
FGP	58.4
SCP	18.0

Question: What are your plans for public awareness efforts for ACTION and ACTION programs in FYs 87 - 89?

Answer: Within limits imposed by budgets in FY 1987, 88 and 89, the agency will continue to produce materials needed by programs to support their efforts to recruit volunteers. Additionally, publicity and promotional materials will be developed to extend ACTION's involvement with businesses, non-profit organizations, and other federal, state and local governments.

Technical assistance -- such as the Office of Public Affairs-produced pamphlets on getting local publicity, recruiting volunteers, and planning and fundraising issued early in FY 86 -- will continue as we seek ways to assist volunteer programs toward greater self-sufficiency.

Well-placed interviews on local, network and public radio and T.V. stations by the ACTION director, deputy director and senior staff will enhance public awareness of the agency and its programs. The same efforts, including Op-Ed pieces, will be made in the print media. Print coverage in local papers on local ACTION projects has always been high, and ACTION field staff and project directors will continue their efforts with local media.

Dr. DOCKSAI. Thank you for attending. The hearing is closed.
[Whereupon, at 12:12 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]